DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 010 JC 890 257

AUTHOR Strasser, William C., Jr.
TITLE A College for a Community: A President's Perspective of Montgomery College, 1966-1979.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 59p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Problems; *Administrator Role; *College Administration; *College Planning; *College Presidents; Community Colleges; Institutional Advancement; *Organizational Change; School Community Relationship; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Montgomery College MD

ABSTRACT

The history of Montgomery College from 1966 to 1979 is traced in this guide to the personal archival collection of the individual who served as Acting President and then President during that period. Introductory comments trace the major changes that Montgomery College underwent between 1966 and 1979, including its administrative separation from the county public school system, its transition from a junior college to a comprehensive community college, and its change from a single-campus to a multi-campus college. Subsequent sections examine: (1) the problems faced by Montgomery Junior College in June 1966, including a lack of continuity in administration and policy, inadequate staffing, and poor funding; (2) the immediate priorities of the college's Acting President, with respect to solving short-term problems and developing a long-term perspective; (3) the President's nine goals for the development of the college, which concerned access to education, participative decision making, community needs assessment, institutional promotion, diversification of programs and services, increase of college salaries and benefits, faculty tenure policies, and community service; (4) the factors that affected the accomplishment of these goals, including legislative actions, citizen activism, collective bargaining, and inflation; and (5) the roles and relationships of the various components of the college community, including the board of trustees, the central administrative offices, the Takoma Park, Germantown, and Rockville campuses, and the division of community services. Endnotes cite particular college documents referred to in the text. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307010

A COLLEGE FOR A COMMUNITY

A President's Perspective of Montgomery College, 1966-1979

by William C. Strasser, Jr.
President Emeritus, Professor Emeritus
Montgomery College
Maryland

Copyright © 1988 by
William C. Strasser, Jr.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. C. Strasser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 890 257

Table of Contents

Section		Page
INTRODUCTION		I-1
1.0.0.	CONDITIONS AND DISCONTINUITIES, JUNE 1966	1-1
2.0.0.	IMMEDIATE PRIORITIES: SHORT-TERM PROBLEMS AND A LONG-TERM PERSPECTIVE	2-1
2.1.0.	A Long-Term Perspective	2-1
2.2.0.	Short-Term Problems	2-2
3.0.0.	GOALS FOR THE LONG-RANGE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLLEGE	3-1
3.1.0.	Nine Goals	3-1
3.1.1.	Goal 1 (Opening More Doors to Higher Educational Opportunity and Improving Accessibility to the College)	3-1
3.1.2.	Goal 2 (Maintaining and Enhancing the Quality of the College)	3-2
3.1.3.	Goal 3 (Inviting and Increasing Participation and Entrepreneurial Activity)	3-3
3.1.4.	Goal 4 (Identifying and Responding to Community Desires and Needs)	3-4
3.1.5.	Goal 5 (Maintaining and Enhancing the Reputation and Visibility of the College)	3-5
3.1.6.	Goal 6 (Diversifying the College's Educational Programs and Services)	3-7
3.1.7.	Goal 7 (Improving College Salaries and Employee Benefits)	3-8
3.1.8.	Goal 8 (Establishing and Clarifying Policy on Faculty Tenure)	3-9
3.1.9.	Goal 9 (Making College Resources Available to the General Public)	3-10
3.2.0.	Intervening Factors Affecting Goal Accomplishment, 1966-1979	3-11

Table of Contents (Continued)

Section		Page
4.0.0.	NEW RELATIONSHIPS AND ROLES	4-1
4.1.0.	The Board of Trustees	4-1
4.2.0.	The Central Administrative Offices	4-3
4.3.0.	The Takoma Park Campus	4-5
4.4.0.	The Rockville Campus	4-6
4.5.0.	The Germantown Campus	4-7
4.6.0.	The Community Services	4-10
EPILOGUE		E-1
ENDNOTES		N-1
APPENDIX: Organizational Outline of the Personal Archival Collection of Dr. William C. Strasser, Jr., President, Montgomery College, 1966-1979		A-1

INTRODUCTION

While employed by an organization, a person typically retains or systematically collects a variety of records and memorabilia documenting some of the relationships between the person and the organization. These records and memorabilia are a set of symbolic connections between the collector and the institution. The president of an organization is no exception to this human tendency to establish a bridge to the past. I, like others, have been a collector, and I write this commentary as a guide to my personal archival collection of various Montgomery College records and materials. Recently, I agreed to donate my collection to the College as a source of specialized information about the College during the years I served as Acting President and President, from mid 1966 to mid 1979.

A personal archival collection can be enhanced by an accompanying narrative and commentary to give coherence and context to the individual elements in the collection--a warp on which to thread the woof, a framework on which to thread individual items to form an archival fabric. Otherwise, single items in the archive may seem to be meaningless fragments suspended in an existential incoherence. Each item is only a part of an episode in a kind of complex chronicle of relationships involving the collector. Thus, a narrative commentary such as this "perspective" is useful as a guide, a framework that expresses the context enveloping the myriad items in the archive itself, that expresses one part of a complex of relationships.

I recognize that any commentary and any archival collection reflect merely the point of view and circumstance of the author and the collector. This "perspective" and its accompanying archive represent, without question, only my own view, the unique view of the president of the College, spanning a thirteen-year period. Yet, I hope the commentary will make the collection coherent and accessible to those who seek items in this archive in the years ahead.

The interval of time represented by this particular archive is significant in the history of the College because the College changed substantially during these thirteen years and, consequently, emerged in 1979 as fundamentally very different from what it was in 1966. The years of my presidency, then, were in a sense years of major transitions for the College--a kind of bridge between two quite different types of institutional role and scope--a time of multiple transitions and significant institutional fulfillment. At least four such transitions are discernible during this span of years.

One historical transition during this time was the transformation of the College from its status as simply one organizational unit among the more than 100 public schools comprising the Montgomery County Public School System, to its status as the community's own distinguished college with its own institutional identity. My presidency began at a time when the College was a small part of a very large school system. When my presidency ended, the

College had firmly established itself as the community's own distinctive and distinguished institution, separate from the school system.

A second transition was from almost total administrative dependency upon the Montgomery County Public School System, to institutional self-regulation and self-management. When my presidency began, virtually all administrative and planning services for the College were performed by the various offices of the Superintendent of Public Schools (not by the president's staff); when my presidency was completed, all administrative services, planning, and operations were conducted by College personnel only--faculty, administrators, and staff--and all College policies and operations were under the overall control of a separate Board of Trustees appointed by the Governor of Maryland.

The third, and perhaps the most fundamental transition for the College during these years was from its status as a junior college to a status as a comprehensive community college. In this transition the scope of the College's programs, services, and purpose all changed very substantially and dramatically in a relatively brief time--and, to reflect this new role for the College, the name of the College changed from Montgomery Junior College to Montgomery Community College (or, in short, to Montgomery College). When I began my service as Acting President in mid 1966, Montgomery Junior College was oriented primarily to recent high school graduates who studied full-time at the College in order to transfer to a senior college or a university; when I left the presidency in 1979, the College was oriented not only to recent high school graduates but also to older adults and retirees, not only to full-time students but also to part-time students, not only to degree seekers but also to those who were interested in continuing education regardless of whether their studies led to a formal degree, and not only to those enrolled in academic credit courses but also to those enrolled in short courses without formal academic credit. By 1979 the College had completed its transition to a comprehensive, diversified community institution for adults of all ages--a college for the community (as the title of the commentary specifies). The College had established its own integrity as a major community institution.

Finally, the fourth transition was from a single-campus college to a multi-campus college. In order to accomplish this transition, it was necessary to broaden the geographic scope of the College from essentially a southern County orientation to a southern and a northern and a mid-County orientation; it was also necessary to create distinctive identities for each campus, to create administrative mechanisms to coordinate effectively the increasing complexity of College operations, and to undertake a major construction program designed to complete a half-complete Rockville Campus, to reconstruct an aged and deteriorated Takoma Park Campus, and to construct a new and comprehensive Germantown Campus. When I began service as Acting President, the College was, by Board policy and administrative organization, a single-campus college; when I left the presidency in 1979, the College was a thriving, new, three-campus institution with a special "fourth campus," an organizational unit titled the "Office of Community Services," whose "campus" was scores of leased facilities throughout the County.

In order to complete this "Introduction" and to assist the reader in understanding the content of this publication, I present in conclusion an

explanation of how the balance of the publication is organized. Following this "Introduction" are four major sections of commentary and narration dealing with the thirteen years represented in the archive. Section 1, "Conditions and Discontinuities, June 1966," attempts to present a description of the College as I found it when I became Acting President of the College in June 1966. Section 2, "Immediate Priorities: Short-term Problems and a Long-term Perspective," contains a narration of what it was necessary to achieve during my acting presidency and during the first year or so of my presidency. Section 3, "Goals for the Long-range Development of the College," identifies nine particular goals I sought to achieve between 1966 and 1979, as well as some of the complicating events that intervened to affect the accomplishment of these goals. Section 4, "New Relationships and Roles," summarizes and characterizes changes that took place in each of the major organizational units of the College as the College evolved between 1966 and 1979. A brief "Epilogue" concludes the narrative and commentary.

In order to relate this publication to the contents of my archival collection, and in order to document the main arguments and substance of this publication, two additional sections appear at the end of the publication. One such section is titled "Endnotes." It presents in numerical order the cross references to documentation items in the archive collection itself; each cross reference is denoted in the text by a number in parentheses--for example "(1)." The endnote corresponding to this parenthetical number is located in the "Endnote" section, and the endnote identifies the particular folder or document or memorabilia item which relates to the statements in the body of the text. Thus, the reader can connect the items in the archival collection to the narration and commentary, or vice versa.

The other section at the end of this publication is the "Appendix: An Organizational Outline of the Personal Archival Collection of Dr. William C. Strasser, Jr., President, Montgomery College, 1966-1979." This final section contains an explanation of how the entire archival collection is organized, what its major divisions and their headings are, and what specific folders or documents or memorabilia are subsumed under each division heading. This "Appendix," thus, is an outline of the contents in the archival collection and is intended to help the reader understand how the collection is classified into divisions and sub-divisions.

I greatly enjoyed my years of association with Montgomery College and with the students, faculty, staff, administrators, Board members, elected public officials, and citizens I knew. Together we created a contemporary college for the community of Montgomery County, Maryland. Long may the College prosper!

William C. Strasser, Jr.
President Emeritus, Professor Emeritus
Provo, Utah
Fall 1988

1.0.0. CONDITIONS AND DISCONTINUITIES, JUNE 1966

From at least early 1965 to mid 1966, the status of Montgomery Junior College (the college's official name then) and the policies of its Board of Trustees concerning the future of the College were unclear and uncertain. The personnel and the students of the College, consequently, lived with institutional uncertainty and discontinuity, and the College was adversely affected by a continuing contention about its future. As a result, the College was distracted intermittently by a plethora of short-range problems and emergencies, lacked a clear sense of its own direction, needed long-range goals, and operated without vision for its future. During this time of turmoil, I was appointed the Executive Dean of the Takoma Park Campus in May 1966, and in early June 1966 was unexpectedly requested by the Board of Trustees to serve also as the Acting President of the College upon the sudden resignation of the first President of the College, Dr. George A. Hodson, who had served only one year as President (1). He left the College in mid June 1966 to become the state coordinator for post-secondary education in Colorado. Prior to Dr. Hodson's appointment in the spring of 1965, Lee L. Ehrbright, an Assistant Dean of the College, had served as acting chief administrator of the College for only about six months (2), after the resignation in February 1965 of Donald E. Deyo as the Dean of the College (the title used then to designate the administrative head of the College). This rapid succession of chief administrators of the College was one significant result (and cause) of the College's difficulties--persistent administrative and policy discontinuities at a time when the College was changing from a one-campus (Takoma Park) to a two-campus (Takoma Park and Rockville) institution (3).

There were other perceived causes of the College's quandary. Dr. Hodson identified some causes and listed them in his personal notes on the situation prior to his departure in 1966. He used terms such as change that was "resented" because it was introduced "too fast," "a few die-hard, vocal, anti-administrative obstructionists who were determined to foil... every move, suggestion," "intrigue," lack of "full, loyal support from all administrative officers," "entrenched department chairmen," and "entrenched ideas (little Harvard) and ways of doing things (registration)." He wanted consequently to separate the institution into two colleges, reorganize the instructional program, rotate the department chairmen, and isolate the "trouble-makers" (4).

In addition, the College in mid 1966 was considerably understaffed in terms of the number of full-time faculty, supporting staff, and administrators needed to operate a two-campus system. Its budgets--both its annual operating budget and its capital construction budget--were substantially less than reasonable for a growing community college. Its organizational structure was an anachronism, oriented to a small one-campus college rather than to a two-campus institution. Its physical plant at the 7-acre Takoma Park campus was antiquated, markedly and disgracefully deteriorating, judged by a local fire marshal as unsafe in some of its facilities, unair-conditioned in virtually all classrooms and laboratories, and lacking or very deficient in many specialized facilities for such basic collegiate disciplines and

accommodations as art, music, physical education, drama, student activities, staff and student parking, and large lecture or assembly halls. Its physical plant at the 90-acre Rockville Campus was new but virtually barren of trees or even the simplest landscaping treatment, with a substantial number of classrooms and offices dysfunctional or incomplete in their construction or operation, with virtually no air-conditioning in classrooms or laboratories or offices, with an obviously insufficient number of campus parking accommodations, and with no specialized instructional facilities designed for scheduled courses and services in such fields as art, music, and drama, and in such endeavors as student government and student activities. Its Board of Trustees (which served also as the Board of Education of the Montgomery County Public Schools) was openly and sometimes deeply, antagonistically divided regarding what the role and scope of the College's programs should be, whether the Takoma Park campus should be closed, what the enrollment capacity of the College should ultimately be (about 3,600 students were enrolled in the fall of 1965), what the College admission policy should be, whether a separate Board of Trustees should be appointed to govern only the College, and what action, if any, should be taken to provide guidelines for the long-range development of the College (5). To attempt to introduce some greater organizational effectiveness into the management of the College, the Board of Trustees in mid 1966 decided to commission a management consulting firm from Florida to analyze the operations of the College and to recommend what actions should be taken by the Board to reorganize the College (6).

Further, compared with many other public community colleges in the nation, the College in June 1966 seemed to need considerable policy, program, and physical development. For example, for a wealthy county the size of Montgomery County (whose population in 1966 was about 445,000), the College's enrollment of only about 3,600 people (some of whom were not Montgomery County residents) was judged by a knowledgeable national consultant to be far less than it should have been compared to other public community colleges in similar areas of the country (7). The scope of Montgomery Junior College's educational programs and services was relatively limited, focusing almost exclusively on the liberal arts and sciences, though the quality of what it did offer was exceptionally good (the "little Harvard" standard). Its accessibility physically was relatively restricted because almost all of its courses were offered only on its two campuses, rather than also at off-campus locations throughout the County or on public television. Its admissions policy was partially "closed door" (rather than relatively "open door") as a result of restrictions on out-of-state students and especially restrictions on County high school graduates whose scholastic grade-point average was below "average." Short term, non-credit courses were virtually non-existent at the college, and the public use of College facilities (for activities other than the conduct of credit courses and student activities) was somewhere between less-than-minimal and almost-non-existent. Further, inasmuch as the College was a part of the school system, it was stereotyped as just one "school" among more than 100 public schools in the County system, rather than being recognized as a distinctive, unique collegiate institution.

Thus, in June 1966, Montgomery Junior College seemed to be meagerly funded, not well recognized, not well appreciated, not well patronized by County citizens in general and by county high school graduates in particular.

The College was relatively low in overall funding and developmental priority within the Montgomery County Public School System and within the Montgomery County government. It was administratively poorly organized and lacked clear, consistent policy from its Board of Trustees regarding its current physical status and its future direction, role, and scope. From its administrative head, whoever that might be, prompt and decisive attention was needed for a sustained period of time.

2.0.0. IMMEDIATE PRIORITIES: SHORT-TERM PROBLEMS AND A LONG-TERM PERSPECTIVE

Upon becoming the Acting President, I was expected, with virtually no orientation and few administrative staff, to begin to resolve the institutional confusion and conflict cited in the preceding section. In addressing all the faculty and administrators at meetings in June and September 1966, I pledged my full energy to serve the needs of the College during the interim of the Acting Presidency, briefed those assembled regarding actions taken or to be taken, and requested them to lend their help and support to whatever actions might be necessary in the interim to cope with and resolve at least some of the conditions and problems affecting us all (8). The general attitude of the faculty, administrators, and supporting staff during these early months was typically supportive and sympathetic, though somewhat skeptical regarding the ability of the College to resolve soon the uncertainty created by the lack of clear, consistent policies concerning the future of the College.

As Acting President, I set two immediate priorities for myself and my administrative staff. First, I intended promptly to identify the significant operational problems adversely affecting the College (and there were many) and to initiate administrative action to resolve as many such problems as possible in the summer, fall, and winter of 1966. Second, I was determined that, even though there were disagreement and uncertainty about the future role and scope of the College, I should envision for my own administrative guidance a tentative concept of what the future role and scope of the College potentially should and could be. Without such a vision of the potential future of the College, I would be attempting to solve short-term problems without taking into account the implications of such solutions for the desired long-range development of the college. When possible, it seemed to me, short-term problems should be solved so that the solutions to those problems would advance the College toward desirable long-range outcomes. Otherwise, short-term solutions could obstruct long-range development or could waste resources and create additional, unnecessary problems.

2.1.0. A Long-term Perspective

Montgomery Junior College in June 1966 lacked a clear and established long-range purpose and related goals to guide its President and the institution itself. I knew that the College would soon need to be reorganized for the long term in response to the management study authorized by the Board in June 1966, and I knew that long-range construction of College facilities would need to be planned soon in order to respond effectively to expected increases in College enrollment. In mid 1966 I made my own interim assumptions about the long-range purpose and direction of the College so that

reasonable decisions could be made in solving short-range College problems and in planning for its future. These assumptions were based on what I knew about the current and projected characteristics of the population of Montgomery County, about the current characteristics, problems, and potential of Montgomery Junior College, and about community colleges in the United States.

What I chose to assume as an interim long-range vision of the College was that it should become a diversified, multi-campus, community-oriented college (rather than a single-campus, relatively limited-purpose junior college). The implications of such a long-range vision of the college were substantial, and, in mid 1966 as well as throughout many of the years of my ensuing presidency, such a concept was controversial among some outspoken faculty, Board members, and community leaders. This long-range vision implied a relatively "open-door" admissions policy with appropriate educational support services and remedial courses, rather than the partially "closed-door" policy in effect in mid 1966. It implied accessible facilities located at least on two campuses (or more campuses if warranted), with some courses and services located at many off-campus sites in the County and perhaps some offered via television. It implied maintaining and enhancing the quality of the College in whatever was undertaken. It implied a substantial increase in enrollments, day and night, year around, to respond to the burgeoning population of the County. It implied a major diversification and expansion of the College's courses and its degree and certificate programs, as well as the initiation of non-credit courses and related services. It implied the creation and operation of many advisory groups of citizens and College personnel to identify and to respond to the particular needs and desires of the highly educated, affluent, community-active population of the County and of the employers located in the County. It implied major increases in budgeted funds for salaries to attract and retain quality faculty and staff, and for improvements in College facilities, equipment, and operations. It implied relatively rapid, substantial, and continuing change by the College--a potentially exhaustive process for faculty, staff, administrators, and Board members. Eventually, this long-range vision was indeed institutionalized by due processes and was effectively realized in operation by 1979. But, sometimes in the interim between 1966 and 1979, obvious and significant stresses and strains inevitably developed within the College and between the College and some of the community. And, intervening events sometimes exacerbated the strains, or altered or delayed implementation of one or another aspect of the vision. All in all, however, the vision eventually materialized only because it was an expression of the will and desire of many of the people within the College and within the community.

2.2.0. Short-term Problems

Some of the short-term problems (which I shall call the first type) facing the College in June 1966 were solved directly and in a relatively short time, a matter of a few months. Other short-term problems (the second type) were much more complex than the first type and required several stages and

several years to resolve. Among the first type were those associated with physical facilities, budgeted funds, College organizational structure, numbers of authorized full-time personnel, and the decentralization of the management of the College within the overall management structure and operation of the Montgomery County Public School System.

The first type of short-term problem we attempted to cope with immediately and began to resolve "en masse" during the summer of 1966 because this type of problem greatly hampered the daily, on-going functioning of the College. Physical facilities at the Takoma Park Campus in particular needed much remedial attention inasmuch as they had been allowed to deteriorate for many years and inasmuch as the local fire marshal demanded in the summer of 1966 that major alterations be made to them to assure the safety of occupants of several campus buildings. Funds for these physical projects had not been budgeted, so I requested emergency funds of $100,000 to $200,000 from the Board of Trustees and proceeded to authorize projects to paint extensively, to alter interiors and exteriors of buildings, to construct fire walls and doors, to air condition some classrooms, and to create an on-campus parking lot and lighting for the lot; some of these alteration projects took several years to complete (9). I further requested the Board of Trustees to increase immediately and substantially the number of and funding for full-time faculty and staff for the College. I also began to work with the consultant firm appointed by the Board of Trustees to analyze College operations and to make recommendations to the Board for the reorganization of the College. I gained authority and staffing from the Board of Trustees and the Superintendent of Schools (who served by state law as the Secretary-Treasurer of the Board of Trustees, and to whom the President of the College reported administratively) to begin to transfer responsibility from the school system to the College for personnel management, budgeting, and facilities planning; I also created more frequent and direct access by the President to the Board through and with the Superintendent (10). Thus, the College began a long journey with many small, but previously neglected steps.

I also began in the summer of 1966 to address the second type of short-term problem. Included in this type were arrangements for an evaluation of the College by the regional accreditation association, modifications to the College's admissions policy and procedures to open the College's doors to more citizens, diversification of the programs and services of the College, creation of incentives for entrepreneurial activity by the College faculty, creation of non-credit community services courses, encouragement for the public to use College facilities, definition of the long-range purpose and locations of the College, and enhancement of the visibility and reputation of the College. For some of these matters, a series of advisory committees or consultants was appointed to analyze and to recommend specific actions, usually with considerable input to the consultants or committees (or with membership on the committees) from among College personnel and community members, and sometimes from among officials of state or local government when government relations or regulations were involved. Among the advisory committees and consultants so appointed in those very early years were the following: the Steering Committee for the Self-Study for the 1966-1968 Middle States Evaluation of Montgomery Junior College (11); the Odell MacConnell Associates, Inc. (12); the Special Committee to study the Future of the Takoma

Park Campus (13); the Associated Consultants in Education (14); the Community Advisory Committee for a Long-Range Master Plan for Montgomery Junior College (15); and the Committee on Long-Range Educational Planning for Montgomery Junior College, sometimes know as the EPIC Committee (16).

Solutions for some of the second type of problem were sought through requests to specific College-level or campus-level faculty committees or administrators to make recommendations or devise new procedures or modes of operation. Among the short-term problems so addressed were typically those associated with the encouragement of the entrepreneurial activity of the faculty, changes to the admissions policies and procedures of the College, diversification of the credit courses and degree programs of the College, and responses to the evaluation of the College by the regional accreditation organization.

Solutions for some other short-term problems were addressed by a reorganization of the administrative offices or by the creation of new administrative offices. Individual administrators were then assigned the on-going responsibility for developing and conducting services and operations to resolve the immediate problem or to service the need that caused the problem. Some of the complex problems approached in this manner in the period 1966-1969 led to the creation of the following individual administrative offices: Dean of Faculty, Public Information, Budgeting, Finance, Internal Auditing, Facilities Planning, Community Services, Program Development, Institutional Research, and Personnel. These offices had never existed at the College because the College had used the centralized administrative services of the Montgomery County Public school System prior to 1967. Also, as an aspect of the reorganization of the College, the Board of Trustees, after consultation within the College, decided in February 1967 to appoint me as President for a term extending through June 30, 1970, and requested me to continue to reorganize and to plan the continued development of the College. In the years 1969 and 1974, the Board further extended my appointment as President through June 1979 (17).

3.0.0. GOALS FOR THE LONG-RANGE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLLEGE

Though in 1966 I developed a concept of what I thought the College could and should become within about a decade, the realization of this overall long-range concept depended upon whether a number of future key developments took place within the College and within the community. Nine such developments became the focus of the major efforts of the college for various periods between 1966 and 1979. These key developments, or changes, were the essence of my administration's long-range goals for the evolution of the College. Each goal was important in itself, but insufficient in itself to effect the overall desired development of the College. Consequently, most of these goals were pursued concurrently or in coordination over a period of years, some for all thirteen years of my acting presidency and my presidency (18). Some of the goals overlapped or reinforced each other inasmuch as they related to similar aspects of the College. Some of the goals were expressed in Board policy, some in budget proposals, some in recommendations of various governance groups and advisory committees, and others in other forms and forums. Pursuit and gradual, though sometimes only limited, attainment of the goals created a synergistic effect which helped to develop the College more fully and diversely than many people thought possible or probable in the mid 1960's. Naturally, there were intervening factors, many unforeseen in 1966, that slowed progress on the fulfillment of some of the goals or that altered some of the goals during their implementation. The nine particular goals as well as some of the intervening factors are explained in the balance of this section.

3.1.0. Nine Goals

3.1.1. Goal 1

Opening more doors to higher educational opportunity and improving accessibility to the College were basic for the evolution of the College into a comprehensive community institution. Implementation of this goal required the College to create a large number of new policies and to change some of its existing policies and practices, and to view itself as a community-oriented college for post-high-school adults of virtually all ages. (In 1966 the College offered only a limited group of courses, predominantly only in the liberal arts and sciences, and its students were primarily teenagers and very young adults, with a very large proportion of full-time students.) Over a period of years the following specific actions were taken by the College to open the admissions "doors" of the College and to make the College much more accessible to a much greater cross-section of the Montgomery County adult population than was typical before 1966. A series of remedial, review, and developmental courses in writing, mathematics, study skills, career planning,

and reading were created and offered by the College. After research analysis, the admissions policy of the College was changed to eliminate discrimination against the admission of selected groups of below-average high school graduates. Tuition and fees for all students were kept relatively and consistently low so as not to discriminate against people with relatively low incomes, and major increases were gained in privately and publicly funded scholarships and other financial aids available to Montgomery College students. Senior citizens were allowed to enroll tuition-free in many credit courses. Procedures and regulations of the College were redesigned to facilitate admission, registration for courses, and re-enrollment as either a full-time or a part-time student. Simplified registration by telephone and mail was introduced, and early registration for courses months in advance of a semester was begun. Public information programs were instituted through many media to inform the public at large, high school counselors and teachers, parents, employers, employees, and public officials in the County regarding the excellent quality and changing scope of the College's programs and services. New facilities and campuses were constructed, containing many specialized facilities to accommodate academic programs sought by County citizens, and countless off-campus locations were used to teach many of the College's courses at places convenient to thousands of employed or retired adults. Public television channels were used to teach College courses for academic credit. The College calendar was modified to schedule teaching terms on a year-round basis, night and day, weekdays and weekends, for short "mini" terms or full academic semesters, on and off campus. Modifications for the handicapped were made in the College's physical facilities and in its support services (such as counseling, tutoring, and special equipment). Honors courses were increased in number to serve bright students. Varied teaching styles and techniques were developed to appeal to and to help motivate the heterogeneous student body of the College, including not only lecture and discussion methods, but also television, self-paced learning laboratories, various audio-visual media, laboratory and clinic and studio and seminar approaches, small-group and independent study, auto-tutorial and tutorial study, and credit by examination. Thus, by June 1979, the enrollment of the College was about 50,000 per year in credit and non-credit courses, in contrast to about 10,000 per year in 1966 (19).

3.1.2. Goal 2

Maintaining and enhancing the quality of the College was a particularly important goal because of the need to respond to the high expectations of the well educated, affluent population of the County. Although Montgomery Junior College had established an excellent reputation in its endeavors as a limited-purpose college prior to 1966, it was important after 1966 to maintain and to enhance that reputation in both the previously established and the new undertakings that were necessary to transform the College into a highly visible, comprehensive community college. Further, because the population of the County was, on the average, among the most well educated and affluent county populations in the United States, the citizen expectation for a high-quality collegiate institution in the County was evident to me from the

beginning of my presidency. At least five specific endeavors were undertaken to assure and enhance the quality of the College between 1966 and 1979. First and foremost, the College sought and employed well qualified faculty, administrators, and supporting staff to teach its courses and to provide its services, and then the College attempted to retain them by providing excellent salaries, employee benefits, and other employment conditions. Second, regular and systematic evaluative analyses were conducted by the College's Office of Institutional Research and Analysis in order to assess the extent to which students were satisfied with the quality of their academic studies at the College, in order to assess the employment performance of graduates of the College (as viewed by employers of some graduates), and in order to assess the academic performance of the College's students who transferred to four-year colleges and universities. The results of these analyses were usually very positive and helpful for the College. Third, a continuing commitment was initiated to purchase and to maintain contemporary, functional, and (to the extent possible) state-of-the-art equipment and supplies for instructional classrooms, laboratories, studios, clinical facilities, performing facilities, television areas, libraries, and general audio-visual services. College operating budgets were very substantially increased and kept at high levels after 1966 to support this commitment. Fourth, more than $50 million was obtained and spent between 1966 and 1979 for construction, equipment, and site acquisition for more than 600,000 square feet of new, functional, attractive buildings and for landscaped grounds for <u>all</u> three campuses. Awards were won by the three major architectural firms which designed these buildings, with commendations for the aesthetic and functional qualities of the architecture of each of the three campuses. The handsome, contemporary appearance of each of the campuses established a fresh, distinguished, physical quality that bespoke a community commitment to a quality college for Montgomery County citizens. Fifth, finally, was a commitment to increase College budgets in major proportions after 1966 to improve the quality of instruction through increases in the support of small classes, additional instructional supplies and materials, released time and extra compensation for faculty instructional duties and projects, sabbatical leaves, honors and remedial courses, library and audio-visual services, and supporting staff and student assistants to aid faculty and staff in various laboratories, studios, libraries, student services, and auxiliary enterprise services (20). The total annual operating budget of the College between fiscal year 1966 and fiscal year 1979 increased from about $2.4 million to about $26.7 million, or about eleven fold greater in thirteen years--a substantial investment in quality as well as quantity of College service, considering that College enrollments increased only about five fold during that same period!

3.1.3. Goal 3

<u>Inviting and increasing participation and entrepreneurial activity</u> by faculty, students, supporting staff, administrators, Board of Trustees, and the citizens of the County were essential. I wanted to open the College's development to the initiatives of people within the College and to citizens outside the College. Creation of a comprehensive community college requires

input, support, and implementation of new endeavors by both those who operate the College (especially the faculty) and by those who are being served by the College, as well as by those who are funding the College (namely, students and taxpaying citizens). Participation and entrepreneurial activities were very significantly increased for all these groups after 1966 (21), though such an increase inevitably led to differences of opinion and disagreements from time to time, especially because of the large numbers of very articulate and well-educated people who populated Montgomery County and Montgomery College during those years. Change usually is not welcomed by all people affected, and continuing change over many years is particularly wearying and wearing on participants, even on those who agree on what needs to be done. It is understandable, though regrettable, that from time to time a cacophony of dissent or disagreement arose regarding some of the continuing changes in the operation and development of the College between 1966 and 1979.

Among the actions I or others took to increase participation and entrepreneurial activity were: increased membership on College faculty governance groups, reorganization of faculty governance groups, and establishment of campus faculty governance systems for each campus; establishment of new systems of elected, internal advisory groups representing students, supporting staff employees, and administrators; released time for participation on governance groups by faculty and supporting staff; Board of Trustees public hearings, conference sessions open to the public, and public comment periods before Board meetings; released time and extra compensation for faculty for program-development and instructional-development projects; increased funding for faculty travel to conferences and to other colleges and for sabbatical and professional leaves for faculty and supporting staff so that they might develop new perspectives and new projects for the College; appointment of numerous study committees and advisory groups with membership from among citizens, faculty, students, administrators, and supporting staff; inter-institutional projects and conferences involving the College with other colleges and community organizations; an increase in the number of advisory groups giving input and advice to the President of the College; invitations to faculty to create new courses; and expressions of appreciation and recognition, including salary increases, for efforts to improve or expand the educational programs and/or services of the College. All of these actions stimulated entrepreneurial and participatory activity and opened the College to initiatives by many.

3.1.4. Goal 4

Identifying and responding to community desires and needs were on-going activities from June 1966 through June 1979. To transform Montgomery Junior College into Montgomery Community College, systematic and continuing means were created to identify and to respond to the particular and relatively unique combination of desires, talents, and needs of the citizens and organizations in Montgomery County. Each community college, as a college, offers courses in many of the liberal arts and sciences and in some of the pre-professional disciplines such as business administration, medicine, law,

engineering, and education. However, to be a community institution, each such college must develop also those particular courses, services, and degree programs needed or desired by its own particular area citizens and employers. Montgomery Junior College did offer a range of the liberal arts, sciences, and pre-professional courses in 1966, but few beyond those. Thus, much, but not all, of the comprehensive development of the College after 1966 needed to stem from the unique mix of desires and needs of the Montgomery County community, and much of the College's effort was directed at this aspect of program-and-services development after 1966.

An excellent example of how this unique community aspect of programming affected Montgomery College's courses and degree programs (in contrast to other community colleges) is the large cluster of degree programs developed by the college in the fields of the fine and performing arts. Almost all community colleges offer at least a few courses in music, drama, and the fine arts as part of the general education component of the college curriculum, but relatively few such colleges offer a full associate-degree program in any one of these three academic fields. Because of the sophisticated artistic and humanistic interests and talents of many Montgomery County citizens, Montgomery College developed very outstanding and very popular degree programs and courses in all three of these fields, with many outstanding faculty teaching these disciplines and with extensive specialized laboratories, studios, rehearsal halls, classrooms, stages and theaters, and art and exhibition galleries. Obviously, many other specialized degree and certificate programs and community services were developed by the College for its own County community, but the fine and performing arts programs are good illustrations of how this community did influence its own college's scope and content (22).

Among the systematic means used to identify particular community needs and desires for which the College could then develop particular courses, or particular degree or certificate programs, or particular services, were: citizens long-range planning committees, study committees focused on one particular aspect of programming, overall master-plan committees, advisory committees to oversee the development and integrity of particular occupational degree programs, research surveys from the College's Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, consultant studies and recommendations, public hearings, recommendations and program proposals from faculty or administrators of the College, requests from major employers in the County, suggestions from elected public officials and County and State agencies, and community forums and conferences on future community needs and trends (23). Usually College faculty, students, and/or administrators served on these groups, in addition to qualified citizens and public officials.

3.1.5. Goal 5

Maintaining and enhancing the reputation and visibility of the College were important in 1966 because of the historically very limited visibility of the College among the many well funded public agencies in the County and

because of the college's image as a small, physically deteriorating, and not-so-well-funded part of the very large and well funded Montgomery County Public School System. A major effort was needed to enhance the reputation, image, and visibility of the College as a high quality, well funded, and distinctive college within the County and within the greater metropolitan region of Washington, D.C. To pursue this goal, the College moved in several directions. The number of full-time faculty of the College was tripled by 1978 (compared to the number in 1966) to maintain a quality instructional program. A major construction and maintenance program was initiated to add and service more than 600,000 square feet of new, physically attractive, and functional facilities situated on handsomely landscaped grounds. In late 1968 the Board of Trustees (Board of Education) voted to separate the College from the school system, as then permitted by state law, and to request the Governor of Maryland to appoint a separate Board of Trustees with responsibility for only the College; such a separate Board, appointed in early 1969, did indeed gain greater distinctiveness and visibility for the College in the eyes of College personnel, the public at large, and the County and State government. An extensive public information and public relations program was established through the Office of the President of the College and the College Office of Public Information. The name of the College was changed from Montgomery Junior College to Montgomery Community College to emphasize the community nature of the institution; the "trade" name of the College for purposes of publication and visibility became simply "Montgomery College." A speakers bureau of college faculty and administrators was established to gain visibility and reputation for the faculty and the College. Citizens advisory committees, with distinguished citizens of the County serving as members, were appointed to develop long-range master plans for the development of the College, and the committees' recommendations were given broad publicity and public hearings. Great care was taken to develop College operating and capital construction budgets that were detailed and well justified in order to obtain major increases in County and State funds and to create public and government confidence in the plans of the College and in the fiscal integrity and sound management of the College. The management of the College was conducted with continuing attention to operational efficiency, economy, and productivity so that College funds could be prudently and conservatively expended and so that the reputation of the College for sound and accountable management would be well and broadly accepted. Open houses were held to bring the public and high school students to the campuses to meet the faculty and see the facilities. An annual "Community College Week" was established and publicly observed to make the College increasingly visible to the community. Hundred of scholarships for graduates of County high schools were established by the Board of Trustees to create awareness of opportunities at the College. Campus cultural activities and performing arts events (such as lectures by renowned experts, summer dinner theater, concerts, musical comedies, opera, and drama) were well advertised and opened to the public as well as to the students and faculty so that the public could enjoy the College and become aware of some of its excellent qualities. The public was invited to use College facilities such as the campus libraries, the physical education facilities (swimming pools, tennis courts, playing fields, bowling lanes, etc.), the cafeterias, and various meeting spaces to attempt to increase use of College facilities and to gain public awareness of the College as a community institution. Reports of the regional accreditation committees in

1978 and 1980 clearly and repeatedly commended the quality of the College faculty, Board, and administration for their development and conduct of the College (24).

3.1.6. Goal 6

Diversifying the College's educational programs and services to encompass a wide range of the collegiate interests of the County population was one way for the College to respond to the community's needs. Diversification also was a means of creating opportunity for an increasing proportion of the County population. Early in my administration I requested the faculty and administrators to take initiative to create many new credit and non-credit courses and to develop a number of new degree and certificate programs, and they responded magnificently throughout the thirteen-year period. The number of credit courses offered by the College increased from about 288 in the academic year 1966-67 to about 689 by academic year 1977-78 (25). Between 1966 and 1979, this noteworthy expansion and diversification of credit courses offered by the College included courses in many of the liberal arts and sciences disciplines, as well as courses in the technological and occupational fields of study. For example, the number of courses in the disciplines of English, art, history, music, philosophy, physics, political science, sociology, speech and drama, and psychology doubled or tripled during this thirteen-year period (25). Even more dramatically, the number of non-credit classes grew from none in academic year 1966-67 to about 652 in academic year 1977-78 (26). Further, the number of degree and certificate programs increased from about 34 in academic year 1966-67 to about 80 in academic year 1977-78 (27). Additionally, in response to faculty and student requests during the period of student unrest and activism in the late 1960's and early 1970's, non-credit courses under the auspices of a "free university" of student activities, as well as credit courses developed through a newly initiated, campus-based "exploratory" program, were systematically incorporated into the College's offerings. The Office of Community Services began in 1967, and by 1979 had developed enrollments of 12,000 or more per year in non-credit courses (in addition to the various conferences, institutes, and cultural activities sponsored by this Office). Specialized credit courses were developed by campus librarians and counselors to help students succeed in college. Television courses were offered by the College in cooperation with the Maryland public television network. Honors and remedial skills courses were created. Lectures by renowned national speakers and varied cultural activities in the fine and performing arts were offered to the community by faculty and student groups and by touring professionals. Major changes were requested in the general-education degree requirements of the College in order to systematize this aspect of the associate degree awarded by the College (28). In short, the number of credit and non-credit courses, cultural activities, and conferences sponsored by the College during these years increased tremendously.

3.1.7. Goal 7

Improving College salaries and employee benefits required a sustained effort during the years of my presidency. A steady, sometimes high rate of inflation of the dollar throughout many of these years necessitated salary adjustments to offset erosive monetary effects. Salary and benefit improvements were desirable also because we sought to attract well qualified faculty, supporting staff, and administrators and because we wanted to compete well against other quality colleges and universities for such people. Finally, once we had attracted well qualified and enterprising faculty and staff, we wanted to retain them. Our ambition was to make College salaries and benefits among the very best in the nation, and we succeeded, as the following statistics demonstrate.

According to the College's Faculty Committee on the Professional Status of the Faculty, the average of full-time faculty salaries paid at the college for the academic year 1965-1966 ranked well below the third quartile of national statistics on collegiate salaries as compiled and published by the American Association of University Professors and by the National Education Association (29). By the fall of 1976, full-time faculty salaries and benefits (total faculty compensation) at the College had risen for all professorial ranks to a level higher than at least the 80th national percentile of comparable colleges, as measured by the national standards of the American Association of University Professors (30). This national ranking would have been considerably higher had the College's retroactive, annual merit-salary increments and the 3% retroactive cost-of-living adjustment granted by the College been included that year in the AAUP statistics. By academic year 1977-78, average salaries for full-time faculty at the College, in terms of averages for each of the three campuses of the College, ranked first (highest), third, and fifth among the 44 private and public colleges and universities in Maryland; salaries at the Johns Hopkins University ranked second highest in the state. By the fall semester of 1979, based on my recommendations for College salaries and benefits, as adopted by the Board in the spring of 1979 (before I completed my presidential term), both the average College faculty salaries and the total average faculty compensation at the Rockville and Takoma Park Campuses (with a total of 330 full-time faculty on those two campuses) were among the top five percent nationally for community colleges; at the Germantown Campus, which employed only 17 full-time faculty out of the total of 347 full-time faculty in the fall of 1979, the ranking for both the average faculty salary and the average total faculty compensation was somewhat lower, in the top twenty percent nationally (31). Thus, by the late 1970's full-time faculty salaries at the College were indeed among the very best in the nation and in Maryland. Though emphasis on salary improvement was placed on salaries for full-time faculty, salaries for College supporting staff and administrators also improved substantially during the thirteen-year period, though comparable national and state statistics were not available for a detailed analysis of these other two types of positions. Finally, benefits (such as health and life insurance, paid leave, summer faculty employment, travel funds, health examinations, pensions, and faculty released time for instructional and program development projects) also were improved during the thirteen-year period (32).

3.1.8. Goal 8

Establishing and clarifying policy on faculty tenure became necessary chiefly because of the separation of the College from the school system, but also because of the somewhat unpredictable shifting of enrollment among the many varied credit courses taught by the College and because of the introduction of new College programs and services as the College grew and diversified. In anticipation of the College's separation from the school system, a standard employment contract for full-time faculty, for exclusive use by the College, was developed by the College faculty and administration and approved by the Board in 1967. This 1967 contract was revised from time to time after 1967, but remained in use at least throughout my administration of the College (33). However, clarification of the College's overall policy on tenure was needed, and the clarification was intended primarily to maintain the College's practice of granting faculty tenure (i.e., continuing academic-year employment except in cases of warranted termination for just cause), but with a limit on the maximum percent of full-time faculty who could be granted tenure status by the College. In order to encourage a large proportion of the full-time faculty to commit themselves to teaching at the College on a long-term, relatively secure basis, the College had established long before 1966 a system of formal faculty contracts granting tenure to well qualified, experienced faculty after a probationary period of service at the College, but not a system that granted tenure or tenure contracts to all full-time faculty (34). Some faculty, years before 1966, were issued annual or short-term temporary contracts because their long-term, continued employment could not be assured by the College for various reasons, such as expiration of federal-grant funds, temporary employment to replace a faculty member on leave, or unpredictable enrollment in some College courses or degree programs. By the fall semester of 1974, about 88% of the full-time faculty of the entire College were tenured or had been notified that they would receive tenure by July 1, 1975 (35). Nationally, the percent of full-time college and university faculty with tenure in 1974, as reported by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was 46.8%, or about half the proportion at the College (36). Other national studies reported similar figures (37). Clearly, the College could not continue to encourage such a very large percent of the full-time faculty to expect continuing faculty employment by the College in their particular specialized teaching fields, particularly because of shifting enrollments among courses. Some reasonable, proportional limit by department or discipline, it was believed by the Board and administration, should be set to guide the issuance of future faculty contracts.

I believed the proportion eventually should be no more than 80% tenured faculty in each teaching field (except highly specialized fields in which only one full-time faculty member was employed); temporary or short-term-contract faculty (on a full-time basis) and/or part-time faculty could be used to teach the balance of the courses in that specialized teaching field or discipline (38). The faculty of the College, through their representatives on the Faculty senate as well as in person at faculty meetings, strongly disagreed

and proposed that no proportional limit be established. Because of the contrary opinion of the faculty, no formal policy to set a proportional limit was approved by the Board or the President. However, few tenure contracts were issued to new faculty after about 1975, though some tenure contracts continued to be issued when justified after that year, and issuance of tenure contracts otherwise continued at least through June 1979. By the fall of 1977, about 87% of the full-time faculty were on tenure at the College (39), and by the fall of 1978 about 80% of the full-time faculty were on tenure (40), the decreasing percent being attributable essentially to voluntary retirements and resignations by tenured full-time faculty.

3.1.9. Goal 9

Making College resources available to the general public (in reasonable ways beyond the offering of formal credit and non-credit courses) was a prudent way to offer to County and state taxpayers benefits made possible by the County and state funds used to construct and operate the College. Before 1966, little initiative was taken by the College to invite the public at large to use the College's facilities for such activities as conferences, community and other group meetings, reading and browsing in the campus libraries, exercising and recreating on campus, and conducting dinner meetings, community theater, and concerts; in general, the community was not aware that its own College's facilities and services could be utilized as community resources. After 1966, College policies and procedures were developed and implemented to invite the public to share many of the College's increasing resources in new or different ways. One such practice was to make available to the public various classrooms and specialized facilities such as auditoriums, lecture halls, outdoor and indoor recreational areas (e.g., tennis courts, ball fields, gymnasiums, and swimming pools), and campus cafeterias. Some of these facilities were available only by advance reservation and/or payment of user fees (if costs warranted a charge for services rendered and if the facility was not needed for College classes or meetings of College groups). Another new practice was to allow the public to use the College's libraries and to issue borrower's cards to those adults who wished to borrow library materials. A third practice was to advertise and to open campus art exhibits, lectures, theater and music events, and summer dinner theater to the public so that the cultural life of the campus could be enjoyed by the community at large as well as by students. Fourth, a speakers bureau of college faculty, administrators, and supporting staff was formed and publicized to help organized professional, business, and community groups in the County to discover and to use the talents and specialized knowledge of college personnel who were willing to volunteer their speaking services to these groups. Also, formal policies or agreements of "joint use" of some College facilities were authorized to enable local government groups or community organizations to use some of the specialized facilities of the College. For example, the County government's Department of Recreation was allowed by formal agreement to use some of the office and recreational spaces on the Germantown Campus jointly with the College for the purpose of conducting County-funded recreational programs throughout the year for Germantown area residents; the County, thereby, saved

itself and taxpayers the cost of either renting expensive commercial space or constructing duplicate facilities for the northern County. "Joint use" policies were developed also for the performing arts facilities on the Rockville Campus and for some of the physical education and recreation spaces on the College's campuses. According to College statistics, "more than 210,000 persons used College facilities for other than regularly scheduled College courses during the fiscal year 1978, whereas in fiscal year 1966 the number was about 16,000"--more than a twelve-fold increase in 12 years (41).

3.2.0. Intervening Factors Affecting Goal Accomplishment, 1966-1979

Though accomplishment of the foregoing nine goals became the major focus of College efforts between June 1966 and July 1979, a number of significant events external to the College intervened during these years to affect the extent to which the College could complete these goals as expeditiously or as fully as would have been desirable. Six of these intervening factors and some of their consequences are briefly identified in this section in order to illustrate the interactive relationship between the development of the College and the actions of the community of which the College is an integral but distinct part.

In the late 1960's, Montgomery County voters authorized a change from a Council-and-County-Manager form of County government to a Council-and-County Executive form of government. The new local governmental structure took effect in 1970 and caused significant displacements and changes in the County-government power structure and in County public policy. Policy conflicts between the County Council and the County Executive sometimes affected the ability of the College to proceed with the College's previously authorized long-range plans. For example, the entire redevelopment of the Takoma Park Campus (and the related diversification of the Campus programs), the parking facilities at the Rockville and Takoma Park Campuses, the performing arts facilities and programs at the Rockville and Takoma Park Campuses, the initiation and development of the Germantown Campus, the role and scope of the Community Services programs, and the acquisition of land by the College--all were at one time, or many times, affected by policy reversals or policy vacillation or policy conflict between the Executive and the Council, or between one Council and a successor Council, or between one Manager or Executive and a successor Executive. Disruptive delay, cost escalation, and some dysfunctional alterations in College plans were the outcome of a number of these conflicts, though the Council and the Executive were in general supportive of the College.

Between the mid 1960's and the early 1970's, the Maryland legislature and Governor significantly altered the state structure and policy relative to higher education in Maryland by creating 1) the State Board for Community Colleges, 2) the Maryland Council for Higher Education, and 3) when requested by a local board of education, a separate local board of trustees for a particular community college. These new state bureaucracies altered or

rescinded existing policies and introduced a wide range of new policies and procedures. Approval and implementation of many College plans (e.g., land acquisition, program development, facility construction, campus development, budget administration) became much more complicated and uncertain than they had been, as a result of the changing power and policy dynamics among these various education agencies. The overhead costs and time requirements for completion of College projects increased noticeably in consequence of these changes.

As a result of both the controversial Vietnam conflict and later the attempted Watergate burglary and deceit, a persistent and generalized "anti-establishment attitude" developed throughout the United States, affecting attitudes on college campuses. Decisions, actions, and inactions of public officials and groups--real or rumored, warranted or unwarranted--became the focus of disruptive public protests, vandalism, riots, and litigation. Institutional paralysis or unanticipated change often was the outcome. College administrators, faculty, staff, and trustees received their share of the brunt of this anti-establishment mood, and, for better or worse, on-going plans, processes, and programs of many colleges, including Montgomery College, were altered, delayed, or disrupted from the late 1960's till the mid 1970's.

Outspoken citizen-activism and frequent litigation against governmental agencies and public officials became very apparent (one could say "characteristic") in the United States in the late 1960's, and such actions seemed to gain momentum through the 1970's. Consumerism, preservation of historic areas and landmarks, contract interpretation and enforcement, professional malpractice, employee rights, equal employment opportunity, environmental impact, affirmative action, and protection of due process--all these and more were the generic bases for legal actions and court suits during those years. Montgomery College was challenged by its share of litigation and citizen activism relative to such matters as the redevelopment of the Takoma Park campus, employment contracts, equal employment opportunity, student rights and tuition, learning "guarantees" allegedly inferred in College publications, and the establishment of the Germantown Campus. In some cases, such challenges justifiably changed the direction of College efforts; in other cases, the challenges slowed or halted the development or implementation of carefully and appropriately planned College actions, even though major efforts were made by the College to involve representative people and groups and to maintain open access to College officials and College forums.

Collective bargaining by college faculty and staff gained much public attention and momentum on college campuses throughout the nation in the late 1960's and throughout the 1970's. In the late 1960's, the official establishment of collective bargaining rights for school teachers, administrators, and staff of the Montgomery County Public School System (of which Montgomery College was then an organizational division until January 1969) was a strong stimulus for action by some College faculty and staff to begin to seek legislative authority for collective bargaining at the College. Issues about some aspects of the College's rapid growth and development, as well as related changes in College policies, were emphasized and promoted by some of these faculty and staff who desired to form collective bargaining units (or unions) at the College. The Montgomery County Council in the 1970's

publicly supported state legislation for collective bargaining by College faculty, and the Maryland legislature enacted such enabling provisions in the late 1970's, though no collective bargaining agent was authorized by College faculty in the 1970's. Such organizing efforts and differences of opinion consumed increasing amounts of energy and time of faculty, staff, administrators, and Board members, and tended to upset periodically the collegial environment and the balance of good will desirable for college administration.

Substantial inflation of the dollar in the 1970's, regardless of its cause, not only disrupted the national economy, but also altered the ability of colleges to maintain timely progress toward goals or, in some instances, to maintain the status quo in current college commitments. Rapid deterioration in the purchasing power of the dollar was accompanied by vigorously outspoken and justifiable objections from College faculty and staff, whose meagerly increasing salaries and benefits during some of the 1970's bought only a lower and lower standard of living for themselves and their families. Increasing enrollments at the College during these years required more dollars from student tuition and from state and County taxpayers, all of whom themselves had difficulty just keeping up with inflation from year to year. Pressures to economize and conserve resources, but simultaneously to maintain quality and growth, seemed at times to antagonize all concerned. The result of these cross pressures was to create a continuing, antagonistic, stressful element in relations among the College administration, faculty, staff, students, Board members, government officials, and taxpayers. Regardless of how much or how little the College budget increased from year to year, the amount finally authorized seemed insufficient to those who requested the budgeted expenditures, but too much to those who paid taxes or tuition to support the College's programs and services.

Almost all of these foregoing events tended to continue intermittently from the late 1960's to the late 1970's. Almost all of them required changes, year after year, in the customary manner of operating and administering Montgomery College--or virtually any American college. Collectively, the result of such persistent, sometimes conflicting changes was to weary those involved, some people much more than others--to weary people gradually in the early to mid 1970's, but increasingly in the late 1970's--to sap energy, to accelerate contrary or conservative responses, to increase frustration, to drain motivation, to make many feel at times somewhat helpless to restore a reasonable pace and a collegial milieu for the on-going relationships among the people of the college community. Nevertheless, together we managed to continue to help many students learn and to enrich greatly the cultural life of the community.

4.0.0. NEW RELATIONSHIPS AND ROLES

As the College grew, developed, and gradually attained its goals between 1966 and 1979, the roles and relationships of the organizational units within the College evolved continuously. Like the evolution of the College, the evolution of each of its various units (e.g., the Takoma Park Campus, the Rockville Campus, the Board of Trustees, etc.) was rapid and sometimes uneven, and by 1979 each unit emerged from this evolution as a very different entity from what it had been in 1966. As a distinct organic part of the whole institution, each unit developed in its own particular manner and dimensions. This section briefly characterizes the new roles and relationships that evolved among the major organizational units of the College during this period. The particular units described and analyzed in the following sub-sections are the Board of Trustees, the central administrative offices, the Takoma Park Campus, the Rockville Campus, the Germantown Campus, and the Community Services.

4.1.0. The Board of Trustees

The role of the College Board of Trustees evolved from a part-time function of the elected County Board of Education in 1966 to a full-time and separate responsibility of a gubernatorially appointed group of County citizens beginning in 1969. People who were appointed to the Board tended to be articulate and influential citizens who were very supportive of the College and who conscientiously and effectively promoted and advocated--within the College, the County, and the State,--the goals, development, quality, and growth of the College. As a group, they were proactive, not passive, and were instrumental "partners" in stimulating the College to become a vibrant, entrepreneurial, and comprehensive institution serving the citizens of the County with an excellent quality of collegiate programs, services, and facilities (42).

In the mid 1960's the role and scope of the College were unsettled and controversial, both within and outside the College. Between 1966 and 1969, the Board of Trustees (Board of Education) was supportive of the College as one division of a very large suburban school system with more than 100,000 students in elementary and secondary schools. Increasingly during these years, however, the time and attention of the Board were drawn to the financial, programmatic, and physical facilities needs and problems of the public schools and to the collective bargaining demands, commitments, and issues of the approximately 10,000 teachers, administrators, and supporting staff employed by the school system. When, at the request of the Board of Education, the Governor of Maryland appointed a separate Board of Trustees for the College in January 1969, the College was much in need of a full-time, active group of citizens with policy-making power to help shape the College at

a critical stage in its development. The new Board enthusiastically assumed its responsibilities to assist in the short-term strengthening of the College, in the delineation of a clear long-term direction for the role and scope of the College, and in the provisions necessary for the College's transition from a relatively small, school-oriented junior college to a relatively large, comprehensive, community-oriented college.

Among the long-range policy guidelines adopted by the Board from 1969 through the early 1970's were the following paraphrased principles (43). The College would be multi-campus, with at least three main locations--Takoma Park, Rockville, and Germantown--and other locations if needed and available. The College would be comprehensive in its scope, offering career-oriented as well as transfer-oriented degree and certificate programs, and offering courses for academic credit as well as courses for adult continuing education without academic credit. The College would actively make many of its facilities available for appropriate use by the community for purposes other than classes, but obviously with first priority for College classes and events. Tuition and fees for County residents would be intentionally kept low and would be supported by a wide range of student financial aids. College enrollments would be allowed to grow without any specified ultimate "ceiling," except for "ceilings" for some few specialized degree programs (such as nursing and music), which required some limit because of their cost of operation. The Takoma Park Campus would be expanded physically and geographically, and be redeveloped; the Rockville Campus would be completed and expanded in its enrollment capacity to accommodate about 9,000 to 10,000 students; the Germantown Campus would be designed to accommodate about 2,000 students initially and to grow to accommodate more than 10,000 students in the long-range future. These principles guided college planning, funding, and development throughout the 1970's.

Further, the Board assumed other significant responsibilities during these years. Board members were accepted by publicly elected County and State officials as authoritative spokespeople and knowledgeable representatives of the College; thus, the Board successfully assisted in obtaining County and State funds for land as well as for facilities development, program diversification, and major improvements in College salaries and employment benefits. In their role as spokespeople, Board members often helped to shape and influence public policy in higher education in the County and the State, and thus supported and strengthened the College as the College strove to achieve its goals. The Board deliberately and clearly established its meetings as frequent (usually at least twice a month), open, public forums for the discussion, debate, and resolution of College policy, welcoming differing or dissenting points of view from citizens, students, faculty, and staff. Finally, the Board, in its many actions and representations, successfully enhanced the efforts of the College to become a major <u>community</u> institution for all citizens of Montgomery County (44).

4.2.0. The Central Administrative Offices

In 1966 the administrative structure of the College was very embryonic and highly centralized, with the President unreasonably responsible not only for coordinating on-going daily operations, but also for coordinating and planning the entire two-campus College within the overall administrative operations of the Montgomery County Public School System. The School Superintendent's central staff operated and controlled most of the central administrative systems of the College; hence, there were very few (about 10) administrators employed at the College as members of the President's staff (45). Such a dual presidential responsibility for both current operations and overall College coordination and planning was too awkward, burdensome, and confusing to be effective, and, as the College began to grow in size and diversity in 1965 and 1966, the duality eventually became impossible to maintain. After analysis and consultation, the President and the Board decided in 1967 to begin to decentralize the College administration (46). That process of gradual but deliberate decentralization (sometimes referred to as a "unit management" organization) continued through the 1970's--the President and his central staff assuming less and less operational responsibility, but more and more planning, overseeing, and representational responsibility. Responsibility for the proper daily management of the operations of the campuses and the community services office was increasingly delegated over the years to administrators in those particular units (47).

Because of the embryonic and confused state of College administrative structure and administrative functioning at the time I became Acting President in 1966, it was necessary not only to decentralize the administration of the College, but also to transfer from the central offices of the school system to the President's staff the administrative responsibility for College operations and planning. Such a transfer began in 1966 and extended into 1969, when the separate Board of Trustees was appointed. During these years, the College established many new administrative offices and employed new administrators to be responsible for these offices and functions. Countless new College policies, procedures, operational systems, and standards were conceived and implemented by the College in order to establish administrative patterns appropriate to the College rather than to the public school system. Among the new College offices initiated during these early years were those responsible for campus administration, campus academic administration, campus student services, campus business management, College finance, personnel, auditing, public information, facilities planning and maintenance, community services, auxiliary enterprises, new program planning and development, college-wide student relations, Dean of Faculty, institutional research, data processing, payroll and insurance, procurement, publications and procedures, and budgeting (48).

The role of the President in these rapidly changing and at times turbulent circumstances also changed considerably. To effect the transition from the confused administrative structure of mid 1966 to the complex decentralized structure of the late 1970's, it was necessary for the President to be proactive in order to initiate and to nourish desired changes in the

structure, role, and scope of the College. Such a continuing proactive role sometimes ran counter to the stereotypical collegial image of a college president as a person presiding over a relatively staid and conservative institution evolving deliberatively in slowly changing circumstances. The differences between the proactive approach I took as President and the stereotypical expectations of some of the College faculty, administrators, and staff did cause strains and stresses in relationships periodically, but I believed the times required initiative by the President in order that the College could become a large, comprehensive, reputable community institution in rapidly developing Montgomery County. I set as the three main tasks of the President: 1) the establishment and maintenance of a sound, high quality, decentralized multi-campus organization operating in excellent quality facilities for students; 2) the development of sound and appropriate long-range goals, operational policies and procedures, master plans, and related funding to help the College become a major, comprehensive community college; and 3) the creation of systematic means for the on-going participation of faculty, students, administrators, supporting staff, Board members, and citizens in the planning and operation of the College as the College developed through the years.

Because of the extensive and far-reaching changes envisioned for the College, and because of the need to incorporate the ideas and to gain the understanding and support of people within and outside the College, I believed a wide range of people should participate in developing plans, policies, procedures, and budgets of the College. Obviously, all who participated would not necessarily agree in all aspects of the deliberations, but hopefully, out of all the ideas considered by participants, sound recommendations would evolve and be supported. Consequently, participatory systems were created or expanded within the College, and advisory groups and systems were established to include citizens and to invite citizens to participate. Within the College, standing and ad hoc faculty groups and an elected faculty senate were expanded or newly formed on each campus and at the college-wide level; an elected staff senate and an elected administrator senate were formed; student senates and various student committees were expanded to each campus; college-wide advisory councils and ad hoc groups with representative faculty, students, staff, and administrators as members were formed to advise the President on curriculum matters, new or revised policies and procedures, academic calendars, and academic regulations, among other matters. Citizen advisory committees, forums, conferences, and hearings were formed or conducted--some on ad hoc basis, some on a continuing basis--to advise the College on long-range goals and needs, master plans, career programs, unmet program needs, community services, formation of a new campus, and campus redevelopment, among other aspects of the College (49). Such pronounced and extensive participation was instrumental to initiate and to sustain the changes that characterized College development from 1966 through 1979.

4.3.0. The Takoma Park Campus

With persevering determination between 1966 and 1979, the Takoma Park Campus evolved into a handsome urban campus, but only after extended public debate, litigation, and periodic political vacillation. In 1966, the Campus was a set of antiquated, coal-burning, physically deteriorated, unsafe, unair-conditioned buildings, with only about 1,800 part-time and full-time students enrolled in relatively few degree programs. By 1979 it was a new, contemporary-style, air-conditioned urban campus accommodating more than 4,000 students studying in a large number of varied degree and certificate programs, with a parking garage for the student commuters. The evolution, requiring the acquisition of about 15 residential and commercial properties, was attributable to the dedication and accomplishment of many, many people, among whom were: supportive, enterprising campus faculty, student leaders, and administrators; a steadfast Board of Trustees; an imaginative, patient architect; a supportive Takoma Park Major, City Council, and outspoken citizens; Montgomery County Council members; the State Board for Community Colleges; the State Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Comptroller, and Treasurer; and many state legislators from Montgomery County. Though progress was slow, uneven, and sometimes very frustrating, the net result year by year was a phoenix-like renaissance of the campus in terms of programs, services, and community relations, as well as facilities.

The Campus redevelopment was based on the excellent core foundation of liberal arts and sciences courses established for the Campus by the faculty and administration since the founding of the college in 1946. From this solid core and the new facilities, it was possible for the faculty, with the counsel of some community employers, to branch out to create many career studies in such fields as registered nursing, medical laboratory technician, medical and dental assisting, radiologic technology, fine arts, computer sciences, management studies, office studies, and dental laboratory technology. Further, these new, diversified degree and certificate programs created employment and educational opportunities for many adults, young and older, who otherwise might not continue their own educational development--women, minorities, immigrants, and refugees newly settled in Montgomery County. The new facilities made possible a major expansion and updating of library and instructional support services on the Campus, including expanded library seating capacity, a multi-media and self-paced learning laboratory, closed circuit television and additional audio-visual services, and expansion and updating of the library collections.

The driving energy for this Campus renaissance was the continuing entrepreneurial effort of a great number of campus faculty and administrators. They invested themselves abundantly in this sustained effort, contributing not only their great energies, but, more importantly, their creative talents, educational insights, and professional spirit. Out of their collective efforts emerged such new ventures as: the Television College of the Air, the non-credit courses of the "Free University," the "Exploratory Program" of new credit courses, the "Mondays at 101" lecture series, the Weekend College, the offering of courses off campus, the beginning of non-credit courses under the

sponsorship of the Community Services office, the opening of Campus exercise facilities (e.g., swimming pool, gymnasium, indoor track, handball courts) to citizens of the community, and an annual spring "Academic Symposium" featuring stimulating and renowned speakers for both students and community residents. Truly, the "harvests" of the redevelopment were bountiful, lasting educational and cultural benefits for the Takoma Park and Silver Spring communities--an enhancement of the quality of community life (50).

4.4.0. The Rockville Campus

The Rockville Campus in 1966 physically was a treeless, architecturally untextured, uninteresting, unair-conditioned suburban campus with uniformly box-like, essentially unspecialized brick buildings housing about 2,500 students. Its educational programs, though few in number, were excellent quality, predominantly liberal arts and sciences, with a small proportion of courses in career-oriented fields. The campus was envisioned at that time to become ultimately a campus for only about 5,000 full-time and part-time students, and to be the only campus of the College (the Board of Trustees having previously declared its intent to close the Takoma Park Campus). Thus, in mid 1966 the Campus potential was relatively undefined and its future only vaguely outlined. Relatively undeveloped, it represented an opportunity for new dimensions in community higher education.

By 1979 the campus was a tree-lined and bermed suburban campus with handsome, differentially shaped and multi-textured buildings, with many laboratories, studios, activity areas, performance halls, and other specialized facilities, with a superb library and multi-media center, with about 250 excellent full-time faculty, and with about 10,000 young and older students on campus day and/or night, and with classes in session four seasons of the year, offering many hundreds of highly varied credit and non-credit courses. The Campus by 1979 was planned to accommodate about 8,000 to 10,000 full-time and part-time students (51), and the Takoma Park and Germantown Campuses were planned to absorb enrollments beyond the 8,000 to 10,000 expected at the Rockville Campus. In the long run, the enrollment at the Rockville campus was intended to be maintained at about 10,000 by transfer of some specialized programs to one or another of the other two campuses and by use of various off-campus sites for scheduling of some credit courses (52). The land-locked, limited acreage of the Rockville Campus, the rapid physical deterioration of campus facilities caused by very large enrollments, as well as the limited capacity of the cafeteria and of some of the other specialized Campus facilities, and the desire to maintain attractive open space and treed areas on campus--all of these factors justified the limitation of enrollment on the Rockville Campus and increases in enrollments on the other two campuses and at off-campus locations.

In the development of a master plan for campus programs and services in 1969, it was decided that each campus of the College should continue to offer a well-rounded and high-quality core of liberal-arts-and-sciences courses and

pre-professional courses, but that each campus would also specialize in certain designated degree and certificate programs in order to avoid the unnecessary expense of duplication of facilities and faculty assignments. This principle of campus specialization was the planning guideline for recruiting outstanding faculty and for developing new programs, courses, services, and facilities. For the Rockville Campus, the following degree and certificate specializations were designated, among others: electronic and engineering technologies, computer sciences, physical education and recreation, hotel and hospitality management, child care, public services (such as fire science, criminal justice, and community planning), radio and television broadcasting, and the fine arts, the visual arts, and the performing arts. Such delineation of specialization at an early date in the history of the Campus enabled the faculty and staff to develop superb programs and facilities for such fields as art, music, drama, television, library services, physical education and recreation, engineering, athletics, photography, printing, and audio-visual services among others.

Of the various specializations assigned to the Rockville Campus, one particular set of specializations--the fine and performing arts--merits an extended comment because of its distinctive and unusual suitability especially for the Montgomery Community College and the citizens of the Montgomery County. As President, I made in the late 1960's a major multi-million dollar commitment to the arts at the College, a commitment greeted with skepticism by some community leaders because of their doubt whether such a commitment was justified. Probably the overwhelming majority of community colleges in the nation do not offer as many and as varied a set of courses in the fine and performing arts as does Montgomery College. These courses at the College are taught by a large and an outstanding group of full-time and part-time faculty (who are also practicing artists) and are scheduled in appropriately, exceptionally good facilities. In other community colleges, such success in these fields likely would not be as readily realizable. But, in Montgomery County, with its exceptionally well educated, talented, affluent, and leisured population, these courses (as well as the associated fine arts exhibits, musical productions, and dramatic presentations) are very appropriate and, most significantly, are well received year around. The arts, indeed, are a prevalent community interest in Montgomery County, and the faculty in the fine and performing arts responded to that community interest magnificently, prolifically, imaginatively through the years. These faculty provided both educational and cultural leadership in the County, and they achieved commendably for the College and for the citizens of the County.

4.5.0. The Germantown Campus

The Germantown Campus began in effect as requests for site acquisition funds in 1967 and 1968 (53). During the next ten to eleven years, the Campus developed slowly and carefully, sometimes despite vociferous objections from some faculty and despite dissent from some elected public officials. The Campus at first was only a general and vague aspiration in the minds of a few,

but that aspiration grew into a handsome, pastoral, hill-top, solar-heated, air-conditioned campus, distinguishingly serving thousands of students a year by 1979. It was placed on a site in an area that continues to grow massively as metropolitan Washington, D.C., spreads prosperously in every direction around the capitol city of the United States. The size of the Campus site (about 200 acres) was intended to allow growth and diversification of Campus and College programs, services, and facilities as the northern half of the County developed into the 21st century (54). Though the southern half of the County would be served by two campuses (one in Takoma Park and one in Rockville), the northern half would be served by only the campus in Germantown, so the size of Germantown campus site was selected to be large enough to allow long-term growth of Campus facilities without the "land-lock" restrictions characteristic of both the Takoma Park Campus and the Rockville Campus.

Because of the great natural beauty and hill-top prominence of the Campus site, I instructed the architect and the College facilities staff to design low-rise buildings and site improvements that would enhance the rural, hillside landscape (rather than high-rise structures that can be physically intrusive and blatant). The architect was requested to respect the physical integrity and wooded setting of the area. The architect's design, incorporating at the College's request energy-sensitive solar heating panels, achieved this result magnificently, I believe. The Campus design further envisioned a small lake to be constructed eventually at the southern end of the Campus alongside Middlebrook Road, in addition to a phased, sensitive dispersal of buildings and roads throughout the site as the Campus grows during the 1980's and 1990's (55). A nature trail was created on the western, wooded side of the Campus to preserve and to take educational advantage of the natural foliage and specimens. Even the two-million-gallon water storage tank on the Campus (the "Big Blue Marble," as it was nicknamed, constructed by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission on land leased from the College) was designed in the late 1970's as a world globe, at the College's request, to complement the educational purpose of the Campus and to attempt to "soften" the visual effect of the huge tank in juxtaposition to the buildings and the natural environment of the Campus.

One unique aspect of the Germantown Campus was that it was conceived from the time of its early planning to the time it began to operate in 1978-79, as a decidedly community-oriented campus, so that it would be somewhat different in emphasis from the other two campuses--it would direct its orientation to the greater Germantown community (that is, the northern County) rather than to the mid County or to the southern County (56). A number of actions and commitments brought about a special campus for the community. A citizens advisory committee was formed to help guide the Campus in the early planning stages. Athletic fields, tennis courts, and the swimming pool were intended to be available to the community as well as to the Campus through scheduling coordinated by the campus with the County government's Department of Recreation. Certain courses desired by the residents and businesses of the area were scheduled at night, on weekends, and off campus in the businesses and governmental agencies and shopping centers themselves in order to make enrollment possible or easier for these adults. Office and parking facilities on the Campus were made available to the County Recreation Department to use

on a long-term basis as a regional headquarters for the Department so that the County would not need to build or lease separate facilities. Summer day camp, conducted by the Recreation Department, was scheduled on campus for children living in the northern County. Public use of Campus library facilities, including the check out of Campus library books by non-students and the establishment of a children's room and a collection of children's books in the campus library, was planned and publicized. Community organizations and residents were encouraged to use Campus facilities for meetings when the facilities were not needed for classes or Campus-related activities. A nature trail was developed on campus for student and community enjoyment. A festive, family-style Campus open house was held annually in the summer. A Campus career-counseling and job-opportunities service for use by both students and by community residents and employees was created. And, the community responded very affirmatively to its Campus!

Like the other two campuses, the Germantown Campus was established with a strong core program of quality liberal arts and sciences courses and a well qualified faculty dedicated to teaching and helping students learn. In this connection, the Campus initially developed specialized career degree programs in electro-mechanical technology and retail-merchandising management, as well as other degree and some certificate programs in pre-professional studies, general management, computer science, art, photography, accounting, and office studies, among others. Courses were scheduled both on and off campus, and simplified admission and early course-registration by telephone or mail were pioneered by the Campus. The Campus academic calendar for the fall semester was planned to begin later than the calendars of the other two campuses for the convenience of community residents. Campus relationships with high schools were carefully cultivated to develop close working liaison to facilitate student admission and enrollment. Non-credit short courses under the auspices of the Community Services Office were scheduled on campus, and regional offices for some of the staff of Community Services were located on the Campus to make it easy for community residents and businesses to meet with Community Services staff to plan "tailor-made" courses, conferences, and meetings.

Some unique aspects of the Campus were envisioned before it opened, but remained incomplete or undeveloped by mid 1979. In view of the pastoral, open nature of the Campus, a set of horticulture courses and a plant, tree, and shrubbery nursery to cultivate plantings for the landscaping of all of the campuses were envisioned. Equestrian studies, through credit or non-credit courses, were thought possibly to be appealing and of educational value to County horse owners; such topics as horse care, handling, pleasure riding, and competition could be included in credit or non-credit courses, with small riding rings and stables and grooming areas available on campus. Outdoor professional or student summer theater, concerts, and chautauqua-like lecture series--perhaps in an outdoor amphitheater in a dell on campus--would add to the quality of cultural and community life in the northern County. A conference center for community service and management education and training was thought to be useful for the County as a whole and for the northern County especially. Intercultural and international studies, perhaps in cooperation with the other two campuses, might appeal to both some young and some older

students. These potential dimensions, as well as many others, made the future of the Germantown Campus promising and exciting.

Finally, particularly gratifying and supportive was the 1980 accreditation report regarding the Germantown Campus, as written by the evaluation team of the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (57). The report was highly complimentary of the Campus and the College for the evident quality of Campus planning, community relations, teaching, counseling, educational entrepreneurship, library and media services, and physical facilities. The report, though written in early 1980, recognized the long-term effort and active support of hundreds of faculty, administrators, staff, Board members, community citizens and business men and women, and elected public officials who contributed to the success of the Campus from the late 1960's through the 1970's. The commendable achievements of the campus were indeed the outgrowth of many talents contributed by many people over many years.

4.6.0. The Community Services

Founded in 1967, the Community Services division of the College was established to offer custom-made continuing education opportunities to the community, on and off campus. The entire County was its campus, not any single campus or location--it traveled to the people rather than waiting for the people to come to it. Community Services originated the formal non-credit courses and many of the community-related and culturally-related services of the College. Community Services established scores of off-campus and campus locations, rapidly extending non-credit courses and services as well as some of the College's credit courses to sites convenient to the public. It operated night and day, four seasons of the year, and by 1979 served more than 12,000 non-credit enrollments in more than 600 classes per year. It was expected to be flexible, accessible, innovative, and entrepreneurial. Starting with a program budget of about $1,500 for its first year of operation in fiscal year 1968, this division of the College was so successful that it earned enough income by fiscal year 1979 to fully support its own self-sustained budget of more than $1,000,000 (58).

As a flexible, accessible, and entrepreneurial organization, Community Services developed in its early years the capacity to cooperatively design and conduct non-credit courses at the request of individuals and organizations. Together with representatives of corporations, trade organizations, governmental agencies, professional groups, small businesses, volunteer organizations, and/or individual citizens, it identified, planned, and conducted short courses on topics such as real estate, accounting, small business management, current events, community planning, the arts, supervision, entertainment, and computers, among many other topics. It planned and conducted exhibitions, community conferences,workshops, and organization meetings. It jointly sponsored cultural events such as music concerts and drama productions. It managed and financed music institutes and

clinics, and hosted or co-hosted demonstrations, seminars, and lectures on the arts and related subjects.

Its accessibility was fundamental to its rapid growth and acceptance by the community. Although a large number of its classes and events were held on the campuses, Community services placed some of its offices and many of its classes and activities off campus, primarily within the County, but, on appropriate occasions, in neighboring counties and states or in the District of Columbia. It scheduled some classes in high schools, some in private businesses and offices, some in government buildings, some even in motels. It operated programs night and day, year around, for virtually any length of time needed. It rented or used gratis classroom or office space for a night, a week, a month, or a year, if the demand and educational economics warranted. Its schedule of classes and activities was mailed four times a year to all County residents. It operated where it could best serve the people of the County, and the people responded enthusiastically.

Though, for a few years early in its history, Community Services was responsible for scheduling and controlling some College credit classes offered off campus, such responsibility was relatively short lived. For the sake of consistent coordination and management of the academic standards applicable to all certificate and degree programs of the campuses, authority and responsibility for all off-campus scheduling of credit courses was eventually reassigned to the campus administrators. Each campus established an office responsible for the administration of off-campus classes, and each campus was assigned a particular geographic area of the County to serve as its own off-campus responsibility. Thus, on-campus academic standards were integrated with off-campus credit courses. Such a shift of credit courses back to the campuses enabled Community Services to focus exclusively on what no other organizational unit of the College offered--an outstanding array of custom-made, short-term, high quality non-credit courses and services. Community Services performed superbly in these endeavors.

EPILOGUE

"...mist on the mountain,
breeze on the waters,
bright star in the sky..." (59)

In retrospect, the years of the presidency from 1966-1979 were for me fulfilling, stimulating, exciting, and demanding. But, most importantly, they were years of great enterprise and achievement for the College. Such years were the products of the efforts of hundreds of faculty, supporting staff, administrators, Board members, elected public officials, and countless citizens and students who gave very fully of themselves, many times in abundant measure and in outstanding, sustained, exemplary manner, far beyond reasonable expectation. Thus, the College became what all of us together made possible, became what these documents in this collection attest to--an outstanding community college, a major institution that enhanced the quality of life of the citizens of its community, Montgomery County.

These thirteen years were years of transition for a living, dynamic organization. After this transition, the growth and development of the organization continued apace. By mid 1979, the "agenda" was still open, and some significant initiatives begun before 1979 were in process, remaining to be completed subsequently: for example, the reformation of the general-education degree requirements of the College (60), the construction of the new performing arts theater on the Rockville Campus, the construction of the swimming pool on the Germantown Campus, the construction of the assembly hall on the Takoma Park Campus, the establishment of the College's philanthropic foundation to raise money to support some of the College services, programs with international and intercultural emphasis, and the implementation of the last stages of the program and architectural master plans for the Takoma Park and Germantown campuses (61). Indeed, there was an agenda for the future (62).

By mid 1979 the resources and momentum of the College were substantial. Between 1966 and 1979 the College had been transformed into a major community institution that was contributing significantly to the educational, cultural, and economic life of the County. Tens of thousands of people each year were benefiting from the educational programs and cultural activities of the College. Enrollments and community use of College facilities were continuing to expand. Much had been accomplished, but obviously much opportunity and potential remained to be cultivated and brought to fruition in the years ahead.

The closing sentence I spoke to the graduates at the three campus commencements in 1979 epitomizes my feelings about the years I served as president: "Remember: there are Camelots, and impossible dreams can come

true!" (63) I also offered to the graduates at that time some lines I composed as a poem in the late 1970's, lines I think appropriate to close this epilogue:

"When I am gone,
may it be said
I held steady in the wind,
was warmed by winter's cold,
sang pastel songs in the spring,
smiled to feel summer sun,
walked quiet, colorful paths on autumn days,
and loved deeply
the Earth,
its skies, clouds, and waters,
and all life I knew." (64)

ENDNOTES

This section contains the numbered set of documentary notes that connect the text in the preceding sections with the contents of the personal archival collection of President William C. Strasser, Jr. Each numbered note includes one or more references to documents or materials contained in one or more items of the archival collection. Thus, the reader hopefully can comprehend both the context of the archival documents and materials, as well as the detail of the collection itself. A complete organizational outline of the archival collection is presented in the Appendix, which follows this section of Endnotes.

(1) Refer to archival item N-2, "Appointment of Dr. Strasser as Acting President," especially therein to the article from the Sentinel newspaper titled "Strasser Named Acting Head of MJC, Succeeding Hodson," dated Thursday, June 16, 1966.

(2) See page 14 of the Montgomery Junior College Catalog, 1965-1966, in division O of the archival collection.

(3) Refer to item K-1 "Associated Consultants in Education, 1966-1967," and to item Q-10, "Newspaper Clippings," especially therein to the article titled "Multi-Campus Plan Proposed," from the Washington Post, dated November 24, 1966.

(4) Refer to item B-2, "Personal Notes of Dr. George A. Hodson, 1966 and 1969," both the handwritten notes of 1966 and the typewritten letter addressed to Dr. Fox.

(5) Among the archival records and documents useful to a person seeking an understanding of the conditions and problems of the College in 1965 and 1966 are the following: The Jackson County Story by Keith Goldhammer and Frank Farner, the University of Oregon, 1964, and Jackson County Revisited by Keith Goldhammer and Roland J. Pellegrin, the University of Oregon, 1968 (Both of these publications are documentary case studies of the Board of Education of the Montgomery County Public Schools, "Jackson County" being the pseudonym for Montgomery County, Maryland; both publications are in item B-1, "1965 and Before."); two memoranda and attachments, from the President of the College to the faculty and administrators, dealing with the FY1969 and FY1970 College operating budgets, respectively dated January 2, 1968 ("Summary Review, Operating and

Capital Budgets, Fiscal Year 1969," found in Item I-1) and November 26, 1968 ("Summary of College Budget Proposals for Fiscal Year 1970," found in Item I-2); item B-3, "Histories of the College," particularly therein the memorandum from the President to Dr. Fox (dated February 16, 1970, subject: "History of the College 1966-1970"); item B-1, "1965 and Before"; item H-3, "Capital Budget Progress Report, December 1969"; and item H-10, "Capital Budget Progress Report, January 1975."

(6) See endnote (3), above.

(7) Refer to item F-1, "Odell MacConnell Associates Report, September 1966," and item Q-10 "Newspaper Clippings," particularly therein to the Sentinel newspaper article dealing with this report (dated September 22, 1966, titled "5 Sites Seen as MJC Need").

(8) Refer to item N-11, "Faculty Meetings, Personal Notes for Comments by Dr. Strasser, June and September 1966."

(9) See listing of projects in the "Capital Budget Progress Report, FY1967 - FY1970" in item H-3, and see item H-1 ("Capital Budget FY1969") and item H-2 ("Capital Budget FY1970").

(10) For a detailed identification of the many new positions and/or authorities either transferred to the College from the school system or newly created by the College, refer to item I-1, "FY1969 Operating Budget" (a comparison of the budgeted amounts for FY1969, FY1968, and FY1967 summarizes the significant increases taking place at the College in those early transition years).

(11) Refer to item G-1, "Accreditation: Regional and Specialized," especially the "Self-Study Report" therein.

(12) Refer to endnote (7), above.

(13) Refer to item J-2, "Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: Nerden Study of 1967."

(14) Refer to endnote (3), above.

(15) Items in division F of the archival collection are helpful in this connection, especially item F-3, "Long-range Master

Plan for Montgomery Junior College, Community Advisory Committee, 1968."

(16) Refer to item F-4, "Report on Long-range Educational Planning for Montgomery Junior College, 1969," and to item D-6, "Master Plan of Programs and Services, 1968-1969."

(17) Refer to item N-3, "Appointment of Dr. Strasser as President," especially the Board resolution of appointment and the newspaper clippings regarding the appointment. Also refer to item N-4, "President's Appointment Contract and Goals," and item N-5, "Resignation from Presidency," for other relevant documents related to my appointment as President through 1979.

(18) The relative consistency of my long-range perspective on what the College should become is evident in a number of documents, including the following: in item Q-10, "Newspaper Clippings," especially the articles titled "New President Hopes College Will Serve Whole Community: (Washington Post, March 16, 1967), "Montgomery College Comes Long Way in 30 Years" (the Record, October 1, 1976), and "Executive Reports" (Up County Advertiser, March 1977); in item L-1, "Annual Reports of President," especially "The President's First Annual Report" (April 1969), "A Report from the President, Montgomery College: Profiles 1966-1979," and "A Report from the President, Profiles: Montgomery College Facilities 1966-1979"; in item N-4, "President's Appointment Contract and Goals," especially the document titled "The President's Goals for Montgomery College, 1974-1979" (Board Resolution No. 74-139); and in item N-5, "Resignation from Presidency," especially the issue of "Inside MC" dated October 18, 1978, containing my letter to the Board of Trustees, notifying the Board that I did not wish to continue as President after June 1979.

(19) For greater specific detail and documentation, see, among other items, item B-3 ("Histories of the College"), item L-2 ("College Newsletters"), item K-18 ("Danforth Foundation Community College Institute"), item J-9 ("Germantown Campus -- Construction: Ford Foundation, Report on Planning Completed"), and item L-1 ("Annual Reports of President," especially the booklet titled "A Report from the President, Montgomery College: Profiles 1966-1979").

(20) For documentation of aspects of this goal, refer to the College's proposed capital budgets for the period FY1969 through FY1980 (all in division H of the archival collection), to items I-1 ("FY1969 Operating Budget") and I-7 ("FY1980 Operating Budget"), to item F-11 ("Ten-Year Enrollment Projections"), to item C-4 ("Faculty

Development and Instructional Improvement"), to item D-1 ("Curriculum Development"), to item F-10 ("Institutional Research: Student Profiles"), to item D-3 ("Evaluating Courses, Curricula, and Educational Services"), and to item E-2 ("Proposed Student Services Courses, 1975").

(21) For listings of many of the governance and advisory groups and for statistics characterizing participation during these years, refer to item B-3 ("Histories of the College"), particularly therein to page 24 of "Montgomery College: Profiles 1966-1979" and to Appendices 4, 5, and 6 in the document titled "College Development and Service 1966-1978."

(22) For a listing of the new degree and certificate programs introduced at the College between 1966 and fall 1978, refer to item B-3, "Histories of the College," particularly therein to Appendix 3 in the document titled "College Development and Service 1966-1978."

(23) Refer to division F of the archival collection ("Long-Range Planning Documents") for particular published analyses and recommendations; also, refer to item B-3 ("Histories of the College"), especially therein to Appendices 5 and 6 of the document titled "College Development and Service 1966-1978," for listings of various advisory committees and studies related to programs and services of the College.

(24) Refer to item G-1 ("Accreditation: Regional and Specialized"), particularly therein to the report from the Germantown Campus evaluating team (dated April 17, 1980) and to the three reports from the evaluating teams relative to the Rockville and Takoma Park campuses and the Central Administration and Community Services, based on team visits from February 27 through March 2, 1978. Also, refer to item Q-10, "Newspaper Clippings," particularly therein to the letter titled "To Residents of Montgomery County," published by the Washing Star on August 23, 1978.

(25) See statistics on page 24 of "Montgomery College: Profiles 1966-1979," included in item B-3 ("Histories of the College"). These statistics specify the overall growth in numbers of College courses between 1966 and 1979. Also, refer to item O-1, "Montgomery Junior College Catalogs, 1965-70" (particularly to the catalog for 1965-1966) and to item O-9, "Montgomery College Catalog, 1978-80," for listings of courses offered in the various academic disciplines in 1966 and 1979.

(26) Refer to endnote (25), above.

(27) Refer to endnote (25), above.

(28) Refer to item D-2, "General Education, Degree Requirements."

(29) Refer to item C-2, "Faculty Salaries," particularly therein to the memorandum dated December 18, 1967, from the College Committee on the Professional Status of the Faculty, to the Faculty Senate, on the subject of "Faculty Salaries."

(30) Refer to item C-2, "Faculty Salaries," particularly therein to the photocopy of the statistics published by the AAUP Bulletin, August 1977, titled "AAUP 1976-77, Salary and Compensation for Faculty Members in Maryland."

(31) Refer to item C-2, "Faculty Salaries," particularly therein to the photocopy of the news article published by the Baltimore Sun, dated January 24, 1978, with the headline "Faculty Salaries at 44 Schools." Also in item C-2, see the photocopy of pages from the Academe (the Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors) for September 1980, particularly pages 293 and 294, which contain the results of the statistical, national survey of faculty salaries and compensation for fall 1979.

(32) Refer to item C-2, "Faculty Salaries," particularly therein to the five-page "Survey of Fringe Benefits, Fiscal Year 1978," published by the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges to compare some fringe benefits offered by community colleges in Maryland.

(33) For copies of some of the faculty contracts previously used by the College and for some of the related memoranda, refer to item C-1, "Faculty Contracts."

(34) Refer to item C-1, "Faculty Contracts," for documents related to the evaluation of faculty contracts at the College.

(35) Refer to item C-6, "Tenure Statistics," particularly therein to the memorandum of November 14, 1974, from the President to various College deans on the subject "Statistics on Tenure and

Probationary Status of Faculty, by Campus and Department," and to the memorandum (and its related attachments) dated November 6, 1974, from the Dean of Faculty to the President on the subject of "Tenure and Probationary Status by Department for Each Campus."

(36) Refer to item C-6, "Tenure Statistics," particularly therein to the statistical table titled "Percentage of Full-time Instructional Faculty with Tenure," dated January 1975.

(37) Refer to item C-6, "Tenure Statistics," particularly therein to pages 5 and 17 of the publication titled "Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: 1972 and 1974," issued by the American Council on Education.

(38) Refer to item C-7, "Tenure and Academic Freedom Statement, 1974," particularly therein to the memorandum from the President to all full-time faculty and administrators, dated May 12, 1975, on the subject "Major Policy Dimensions and Alternatives Relative to 'Statement on Tenure and Academic Freedom' for Montgomery College." Also, refer to item Q-10, "Newspaper Clippings," particularly therein to the article published in the Washing Post, dated March 1975, with the headline "Faculty Disputes President on Tenure."

(39) Refer to item C-6, "Tenure Statistics," particularly therein to pages 16, 33, and 44 of the publication titled "A Profile of the Faculty, Staff, and Administrators of Montgomery College, Fall 1977," issued by the College Office of Institutional Research and Analysis.

(40) Refer to item C-6, "Tenure Statistics," particularly to the photocopied bar graph titled "Percent of Full-time Tenured and Non-tenured Faculty, Fall 1978," from the Maryland State Board of Higher Education.

(41) See page 5 of the booklet titled "Montgomery College: Profiles 1966-1979," contained in item B-3, "Histories of the College."

(42) For an assessment and comments by the Vice Chairman of the College Board of Trustees, Dr. Howard J. Hausman, see item Q-10, "Newspaper Clippings," containing a letter to the editor published in the Record newspaper on Friday, November 12, 1976.

(43) For statements of the basic elements that were incorporated into the policy principles adopted by the Board, refer to division F of the archival collection ("Long-range Planning Documents"), particularly to items F-3 ("Long-range Master Plan for Montgomery Junior College, Community Advisory Committee, 1968") and F-4 ("Report on Long-range Educational Planning for Montgomery Junior College, 1969"). In this connection, also refer to item D-6 ("Master Plan of Programs and Services, 1968-1969"), with particular reference in that folder to the memorandum and its attachments dated June 12, 1969, subject: "Master Plan of Programs and Services of the College," from the President of the College to all faculty and administrative staff.

(44) Though minutes of the meetings of the College Board of Trustees are not included in this archival collection, the College archives do include the minutes of Board meetings. A reading of the minutes reveals the comprehensive extent to which these various roles and responsibilities of the Board evolved between 1966 and 1979.

(45) Refer to item K-9, "Relations with Montgomery County Public Schools," particularly therein to the memorandum titled "Organization of the Montgomery County Public Schools" from the Superintendent of Schools, dated July 21, 1965, for a presentation of the overall organizational structure of the school system, including the College at that time.

(46) Refer to item K-1, "Associated Consultants in Education, 1966-1967," particularly therein to the memorandum dated October 20, 1966, subject "Progress Report on Management-Administrative Study" from Associated Consultants in Education; the memorandum contains an analysis of the organizational needs of the College at that time.

(47) For various documents relating to the gradual decentralization of the College administration, refer to item K-2, "College Administrative Organization."

(48) The various College annual operating budgets between fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1980 are a detailed source of information on the year-to-year changes in the structure and functions of the various administrative offices and operations.

(49) For detailed statistics and listings of participatory systems and studies, refer to item B-3, "Histories of the College," particularly to pages 9 and 24 of the publication titled "A Report from the President, Montgomery College: Profiles 1966-1979," as

well as appendices 4, 5, and 6 of the document titled "College Development and Service, 1966-1978."

(50) For documentation of some of these aspects of the evolution of the Takoma Park Campus, refer to the following items: J-1 ("Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: MNCPPC Plan of 1962-63 for Takoma Park"), J-2 ("Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: Nerden Study of 1967"), J-3 ("Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: Analyses and General Planning"), J-4 ("Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: Educational Specifications"), J-5 ("Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: Feasibility Study"), J-6 ("Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: Architectural Design Reports and Analyses"), D-6 ("Master Plan of Programs and Services, 1968-1969"), D-7 ("Master Plan of Programs and Services, 1976 and 1978"), F-4 ("Report on Long-range Educational Planning for Montgomery Junior College, 1969"), F-7 ("Unmet Educational Needs, 1974"), and F-6 ("Seven-Year Progress Report, 1973").

(51) The "Preface" in the College "Capital Budget" for FY1969, as well as projections in that budget, explains the long-term enrollment expectations and construction schedule for the Rockville Campus and the other campuses of the College. See item H-1.

(52) The concept of a "ceiling" on enrollment at the Rockville Campus and of the need for the other campuses of the College to accommodate enrollments beyond the 10,000 at Rockville dates back to the mid 1960's. See items F-1 ("Odell MacConnell Associates Report, September 1966"), F-3 ("Long-range Master Plan for Montgomery Junior College, Community Advisory Committee, 1968"), F-4 ("Report on Long-range Educational Planning for Montgomery Junior College, 1969"), F-5 ("Campus MC 2000, March 1970"), and J-12 ("Rockville Campus -- Construction: Classrooms, Library, Learning Resources, Administration," especially therein the article titled "Planning for Change" from College Management for December 1969, as well as the booklet titled "Learning: A Personal Encounter").

(53) Refer to items H-1, "Capital Budget FY1969," and H-2 "Capital Budget FY1970."

(54) See the preliminary planning analysis titled "Campus MC 2000" (item F-5) and the site identification analysis titled "A Location Analysis of Germantown, Maryland" by Real Estate Central, Inc. in item J-7 ("Germantown Campus -- Construction: Site Selection and General Planning").

(55) Item J-10 ("Germantown Campus -- Construction: Architectural Master Plan and Design Reports") contains a map of the ultimate planned layout for the campus.

(56) See items J-8 ("Germantown Campus -- Construction: Ford Foundation Planning Grant, Correspondence") and J-9 ("Germantown Campus -- Construction: Ford Foundation, Report on Planning Completed").

(57) Refer to item G-1 ("Accreditation: Regional and Specialized") for a copy of the 1980 report of the evaluation team who assessed the Germantown Campus. The report is attached to a memorandum titled "Germantown Campus Accreditation," dated July 8, 1980.

(58) See the Community Services section of the FY1980 College operating budget, contained in item I-7 ("FY1980 Operating Budget").

(59) These lines I wrote in 1979 in a series of letters that expressed appreciation to some of my colleagues at the College for their efforts and achievements during the years I served as President. The lines, it seems to me, contain appropriate symbols for an epilogue to this narrative about Montgomery College.

(60) Refer to item D-2, "General Education, Degree Requirements."

(61) See items D-7 ("Master Plan of Programs and Services, 1976 and 1978") and H-14 ("Capital Budget FY1980") and H-15 ("Capital Budget FY1981").

(62) Pages 14 and 15 in item H-16 ("Montgomery College Facilities, 1966-1979") and page 23 of "A Report from the President, Montgomery College: Profiles 1966-1979" (in item L-1, "Annual Reports of the President") contain suggestions for an "agenda for the future" beyond 1979.

(63) See item N-13 ("Commencement Remarks by Dr. Strasser, 1979").

(64) See endnote (63), above.

APPENDIX:
Organizational Outline
of the Personal Archival Collection
of Dr. William C. Strasser, Jr.,
President, Montgomery College,
1966 - 1979

The archival collection of President Strasser is organized into 18 main divisions. Each division is identified in sequence by a particular letter of the alphabet, such as "A" or "B," and by a descriptive phrasal title, such as "Historical Context and Background" or "Long-Range Planning Documents." Within each main division are particular items, each item being identified by a combination of a letter and a number, such as "K-3" or "C-6," and by a descriptive phrasal title, such as "Curriculum Development." The identifying letter corresponds to the particular main division of which the item is a part; the identifying number is the designation for that particular item. Some items are individual file folders containing one or more varied documents such as memoranda, letters, reports, handwritten notes, schedules, photographs, drawings, etc. Other items may be individually bound publications, or various physical memorabilia, or some other materials. Within the archives, each item is appropriately labeled by a sticker bearing its own identifying letter, number, and title. Also within the archives, each main division is set off by a file divider containing its own identifying letter and title.

Presented below, for the guidance of the reader and/or the user of the archival collection, is an organizational outline of the personal archival collection of President Strasser, including in the outline the division letter, the item number, and the title heading of each division and of each item.

Division Letter	Item Number	Title Heading
A		GUIDE TO PRESIDENT STRASSER'S ARCHIVAL COLLECTION
	A-1	A College for a Community: A President's Perspective of Montgomery College, 1966-1979
B		HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND
	B-1	1965 and Before
	B-2	Personal Notes of Dr. George A. Hodson, 1966 and 1969
	B-3	Histories of the College
C		FACULTY
	C-1	Faculty Contracts
	C-2	Faculty Salaries
	C-3	Faculty Evaluation Process
	C-4	Faculty Development and Instructional Improvement
	C-5	Class Size
	C-6	Tenure Statistics
	C-7	Tenure and Academic Freedom Statement, 1974
	C-8	Dean of Faculty
D		CURRICULUM AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
	D-1	Curriculum Development
	D-2	General Education, Degree Requirements
	D-3	Evaluating Courses, Curricula, and Educational Services
	D-4	English Courses, Evaluation and Development
	D-5	Curriculum Advisory Committees
	D-6	Master Plan of Programs and Services, 1968-1969
	D-7	Master Plan of Programs and Services, 1976 and 1978

Division Letter	Item Number	Title Heading
	D-8	State of Maryland, Master Plan for Higher Education
E		STUDENT SERVICES, LIBRARY, LEARNING RESOURCES, AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
	E-1	Student Services
	E-2	Proposed Student Services Courses, 1975
	E-3	Sharyn Duffin
	E-4	College Alumni Association
	E-5	Library and Learning Resources, College-wide Services
	E-6	Community Services
F		LONG-RANGE PLANNING DOCUMENTS
	F-1	Odell MacConnell Associates Report, September 1966
	F-2	President's Report to Community Advisory Committee, 1968
	F-3	Long-range Master Plan for Montgomery Junior College, Community Advisory Committee, 1968
	F-4	Report on Long-range Educational Planning for Montgomery Junior College, 1969
	F-5	Campus MC 2000, March 1970
	F-6	Seven-Year Progress Report, 1973
	F-7	Unmet Educational Needs, 1974
	F-8	Changing Dimensions of the Presidency of Montgomery College, 1977
	F-9	Community Colleges and General Education: Three Perspectives, 1979
	F-10	Institutional Research: Student Profiles
	F-11	Ten-Year Enrollment Projections

Division Letter	Item Number	Title Heading
G		ACCREDITATION
	G-1	Accreditation: Regional and Specialized
	G-2	Accreditation: State
H		COLLEGE CAPITAL BUDGETS
	H-1	Capital Budget FY1969
	H-2	Capital Budget FY1970
	H-3	Capital Budget Progress Report, December 1969
	H-4	Capital Budget FY1971
	H-5	Capital Budget FY1972
	H-6	Capital Budget FY1973
	H-7	Capital Budget FY1974
	H-8	Capital Budget Seven Year Progress Report FY1975
	H-9	Capital Budget FY1976
	H-10	Capital Budget Progress Report, January 1975
	H-11	Capital Budget FY1977
	H-12	Capital Budget FY1978
	H-13	Capital Budget FY1979
	H-14	Capital Budget FY1980
	H-15	Capital Budget FY1981
	H-16	Montgomery College Facilities, 1966-1979
I		COLLEGE OPERATING BUDGETS
	I-1	FY1969 Operating Budget
	I-2	FY1970 Operating Budget
	I-3	FY1971 Operating Budget Charts

Division Letter	Item Number	Title Heading
	I-4	FY1977 Operating Budget Memorandum
	I-5	FY1978 Operating Budget, Transmittal Memorandum
	I-6	FY1979 Operating Budget
	I-7	FY1980 Operating Budget
J		CONSTRUCTION AND SITE PLANNING
	J-1	Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: MNCPPC Plan of 1962-63 for City of Takoma Park
	J-2	Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: Nerden Study of 1967
	J-3	Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: Analyses and General Planning
	J-4	Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: Educational Specifications
	J-5	Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: Feasibility Study
	J-6	Takoma Park Campus -- Construction: Architectural Design Reports and Analyses
	J-7	Germantown Campus -- Construction: Site Selection and General Planning
	J-8	Germantown Campus -- Construction: Ford Foundation Planning Grant, Correspondence
	J-9	Germantown Campus -- Construction: Ford Foundation, Report on Planning Completed
	J-10	Germantown Campus -- Construction: Architectural Master Plan and Design Reports (Buildings 1 and 2)
	J-11	Germantown Campus -- Construction: Ground Breaking and Dedication
	J-12	Rockville Campus -- Construction: Classrooms, Library, Learning Resources, Administration
	J-13	Rockville Campus -- Construction: Parking Facilities

Division Letter	Item Number	Title Heading
	J-14	Rockville Campus -- Construction: Performing Arts Center
	J-15	Rockville Campus -- Construction: Miscellaneous
	J-16	Additional Campus Sites: University of Maryland Farmsite, 2nd Down-County Campus, Shady Grove Facility
K		COLLEGE ORGANIZATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS
	K-1	Associated Consultants in Education, 1966-1967
	K-2	College Administrative Organization
	K-3	Administrator's Contract Agreement
	K-4	Affirmative Action
	K-5	Retiree Benefits
	K-6	General Administrative and Business Operations
	K-7	College Efficiency and Productivity
	K-8	Collective Bargaining
	K-9	Relations with Montgomery County Public Schools
	K-10	College-County Government Relations
	K-11	International Shipboard Conference
	K-12	President's Renewal Seminar, American Council on Education
	K-13	Project Usher Planning and Management Workshop
	K-14	American Philological Association
	K-15	The Schoolmen's Association
	K-16	Rockville Rotary Club
	K-17	Junior College Council of the Middle Atlantic States
	K-18	Danforth Foundation Community College Institute
	K-19	Danforth Foundation Short-term Leave Grant

Division Letter	Item Number	Title Heading
	K-20	Commission on Instruction, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
	K-21	Congressional Internships for Montgomery County Students
	K-22	Maryland Council of Community College Presidents
	K-23	University of Michigan, Center for the Study of Higher Education
	K-24	University of California, Berkeley
	K-25	Council of Chief Executive Administrators, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
	K-26	University of Maryland
	K-27	Miscellaneous Correspondence
L		SPECIAL COLLEGE PUBLICATIONS
	L-1	Annual Reports of President
	L-2	College Newsletters
	L-3	Community Colleges and General Education: Three Perspectives
M		COLLEGE CELEBRATIONS AND EVENTS
	M-1	Presidential Ball, 1968
	M-2	Community College Week, 1968
	M-3	College Silver Jubilee Convocation, 1970
	M-4	Community White House Conference on Aging, 1971
	M-5	Briefings for Elected Officials
	M-6	Symposium on the Community College and a New Town, 1975
	M-7	"Joshua" Opera, 1976
	M-8	Reception in Honor of Board Members and Department Chairmen, 1977

Division Letter	Item Number	Title Heading
	M-9	Dinner Dance for Dr. Strasser, 1979
N		PERSONAL RECORDS
	N-1	Vita: W. C. Strasser
	N-2	Appointment of Dr. Strasser as Acting President
	N-3	Appointment of Dr. Strasser as President
	N-4	President's Appointment Contract and Goals
	N-5	Resignation from Presidency
	N-6	Appointment Schedules of Dr. Strasser: 1966, 1967, 1968
	N-7	Personal Business Card of Dr. Strasser
	N-8	Proposal for National Academy for In-Service Development of Community and Junior College Presidents
	N-9	Consultant, U.S. Office of Education
	N-10	Publications by W. C. Strasser
	N-11	Faculty Meetings, Personal Notes for Comments by Dr. Strasser, June and September 1966
	N-12	Notes for Various Speeches by Dr. Strasser
	N-13	Commencement Remarks by Dr. Strasser, 1979
	N-14	Various Commendations
O		CATALOGS
	O-1	Montgomery Junior College Catalogs, 1965-1970
	O-2	Montgomery College Catalogs, 1970-71, 1971-72
	O-3	Montgomery College Catalog, 1972-73
	O-4	Montgomery College Catalog, 1973-74
	O-5	Montgomery College Catalog, 1974-75
	O-6	Montgomery College Catalog, 1975-76

Division Letter	Item Number	Title Heading
	O-7	Montgomery College Catalog, 1976-77
	O-8	Montgomery College Catalog, 1977-78
	O-9	Montgomery College Catalog, 1978-80
P		YEARBOOKS
	P-1	Accolade, 1952
	P-2	Accolade, 1953-1954
	P-3	Accolade, 1955
	P-4	Accolade, 1958
	P-5	Accolade, 1959
	P-6	Accolade, 1960
	P-7	Shield, 1966
	P-8	Shield, 1969
	P-9	Shield, 1970
	P-10	Libra, 1973
Q		MEMORABILIA
	Q-1	Photographs and Drawings, Takoma Park Campus
	Q-2	Photographs and Drawings, Takoma Park Campus, Architect Walter Netsch
	Q-3	Photographs and Drawings, Rockville Campus
	Q-4	Photographs and Drawings, Germantown Campus
	Q-5	Photographs of Commencements
	Q-6	Photographs, Campus Events and Scenes
	Q-7	Photographs, Miscellaneous Events
	Q-8	Photographs, Board of Trustees
	Q-9	Portraits of Dr. Strasser

Division Letter	Item Number	Title Heading
	Q-10	Newspaper Clippings
	Q-11	Announcement of Renaming of College, 1969
	Q-12	Sample College Stationery
	Q-13	College Christmas Cards
R		OTHER ARCHIVAL RECORDS AND MATERIALS
	R-1	Architects' Signed Copy of Original Drawing of Proposed Reconstruction of Takoma Park Campus, Synthesis Model, 1971
	R-2	Souvenir Bookend with Brick from Demolished House, Block 69, Takoma Park Campus

(Other items will be donated hereafter by William C. Strasser, Jr. or his assigns or heirs, and will be listed as a part of this division of the archives.)

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JUL 14 1989